IMPRIMATUR,

Novemb. 9. 1685.

Hen. Maurice, *R^mo Patri ac D^no* Wilhelmo *Archiepiſcopo Cantuarienſi a Sacris.*

IMPRIMATUR,

Novemb. 9. 1685.

Hen. Maurice, *R^mo Patri ac D^no* Wilhelmo *Archiepiſcopo Cantuarienſi a Sacris.*

THE DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES OF THE Church of Rome TRULY REPRESENTED;

In Answer to a Book Intituled,

A PAPIST *Misrepresented, and Represented, &c.*

The Third Edition Corrected.

LONDON:
Printed for *W. Rogers*, at the Sun over against St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet*. 1686.

THE DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES OF THE Church of Rome

TRULY REPRESENTED;

In Authentic Book Intitulated,

A PAPIST Misrepresented, and Represented, &c.

The Third Edition Corrected.

LONDON:
Printed for W. Rogers, at the Sun over against
St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-street. 1686.

The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, truly Represented, &c.

An Answer to the Introduction.

THE *Introduction* consists of two parts,

I. A general Complaint of the *Papists* being *Misrepresented* among us.

II. An Account of the Method he hath taken to clear them from these *Misrepresentations*.

I. As to the *First*; Whether it be just, or not, must be examin'd in the several Particulars. But here we must consider, whether it serves the End it is designed for in this place, which is, to gain the Reader's good Opinion of their Innocency: Not meerly because they complain so much of being injured, but because the best Men in all Times have been *misrepresented*; as he proves at large in this *Introduction*, from several Examples of the Old and New *Testament*, *but especially of Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians.* But it is observable, that when Bp *Jewel* began his excellent *Apology* for the *Church of England*, with a Complaint much of the same Nature, and produced the very same Examples, his Adversary would by no means allow it to have any Force, being, as he called it, *Exordium Commune*, which might be used on both sides, and therefore could be proper to neither. And altho it be reasonable only for those to complain of being *misrepresented*, who having Truth on their side, do notwithstanding suffer under the Imputation of Error; yet it is possible for those who are very much *mistaken*, to complain of being *misrepresented*; and while

they go about to remove the Misrepresentations of others, to make new Ones of their own. And as the best Men, and the best Things, have been misrepresented; so other Men have been as apt to complain of it; and the worst Things are as much misrepresented, when they are made to appear not so bad as they are. For *Evil* is as truly misrepresented under the appearance of *Good*, as *Good* under the appearance of *Evil*; and it is hard to determine whether hath done the greater Mischief.

So that if *the Father of Lies be the Author of Misrepresenting*, (as the *Introduction* begins) we must have a care of him both ways. For when *he tried this black Art in Paradise*, (as our Author speaks) it was both by misrepresenting the Command, and the Danger of transgressing it. He did not only make the Command appear otherwise than it was; but he did very much lessen the Punishment of Disobedience, and by that means deluded our first Parents into that Sin and Misery, under which their Posterity still suffers. Which ought to be a Caution to them, how dangerous it is to break the Law of God under the fairest Colour and Pretences; and that they should not be easily imposed upon by false Glosses, and plausible Representations, though made by such as therein pretend to be *Angels of Light*.

But altho *the Father of Lies be the Author of Misrepresenting*: yet we have no reason to think, but that if he were to plead his own Cause to Mankind, he would very much complain of being *misrepresented* by them; and even in this respect, when they make him the *Father* of those *Lies* which are their own Inventions. And can that be a certain Argument of Truth, which may as well be used by *the Father of Lies?*

And the great Instruments he hath made use of in deceiving and corrupting Mankind, have been as forward as any to complain of being *misrepresented*. The true Reason is, Because no great Evil can prevail in the World, unless it be represented otherwise than it is; and all Men are not competent Judges of the Colours of Good and Evil; therefore when the Designs of those who go about to deceive, begin to be laid open, they then betake themselves to the fairest Representations they can make of themselves, and hope that many will not see through their Pretences.

If

If I had a mind to follow our Author's Method, I could make as long a Deduction of Inſtances of this kind. But I ſhall content my ſelf with ſome few Examples of thoſe who are allowed on both ſides to have been guilty of great Errors and Corruptions.

The *Arrians* plead they were *miſrepreſented*, when they were taken for Enemies to Chriſt's Divinity; for all that they contended for, was only ſuch a Moment of Time, as would make good the Relation between Father and Son.

The *Pelagians*, with great Succeſs for ſome time (and even at *Rome*) complained, that they were very much *miſrepreſented*, as Enemies to God's Grace: whereas they owned and aſſerted the mainfold Grace of God; and were only Enemies to Mens Idleneſs, and neglect of their Duties.

The *Neſtorians* gave out, that they never intended to make two Perſons in Chriſt, as their Adverſaries charged them; but all their deſign was to avoid Blaſphemy, in calling the Bleſſed Virgin *the Mother of God*; and whatever went beyond this was their Adverſaries *Miſrepreſentations*, and not their own Opinions.

The *Eutychians* thought themſelves very hardly dealt with, for ſaying, there was *but one Nature in Chriſt*; they did not mean thereby (as they ſaid) to deſtroy the Properties of the Humane Nature, but only to aſſert that its Subſiſtence was ſwallowed up by the Divine; and of all Perſons, thoſe have no reaſon to blame them, who ſuppoſe the Properties of one Subſtance may be united to another.

Even the *Gentile Idolaters*, when they were charged by the Chriſtians, *that they worſhipped Stocks and Stones*; complained, they were *miſrepreſented*, for they were not ſuch Ideots, to take things for Gods, which had neither Life, nor Senſe, nor Motion in them. And when they were charged *with worſhipping other Gods as they did the Supream*; they deſired their Senſe might not be taken from common Prejudices, or vulgar Practices, but from the Doctrine of their Philoſophers; and they owned a Soveraign Worſhip due to him that was Chief; and a ſubordinate and Relative to ſome Cœleſtial Beings, whom they made Application to as Mediators between him and them. Muſt all theſe Complaints now be taken for granted? what then becomes of the Reputation of General Councils, or the Primi-

tive

tive Christians? But as, if it were enough to be Accused, none would be Innocent; so none would be Guilty, if it were enough to complain of being *misrepresented*.

Therefore in all Complaints of this Nature, it is necessary to come to Particulars; and to examine with Care and Diligence the Matters complained of, and then to give Judgment in the *Case*. I am glad to find our Author professing so much *Sincerity and Truth without Passion*; and I do assure him I shall follow what he professes: For the Cause of our Church is such, as needs neither Tricks nor Passion to defend it; and therefore I shall endeavour to state the Matters in Difference, with all the clearness and calmness that may be; and I shall keep close to his Method and Representations, without Digressions, or provoking Reflections.

II. But I must declare my self very much unsatisfied with the Method he hath taken to clear his Party from these *Misrepresentations*. For,

1. He takes upon himself to draw a double Character of a Papist; and in the one he pretends to follow a certain Rule, but not in other; which is not fair and ingenuous.

As to the one, he saith, *He follows the Council of* Trent, *and their allowed Spiritual Books & Catechisms*: and we find no fault with this. But why must the other Part then be drawn by Fancy, or common Prejudices, or ignorant Mistakes? Have we no Rule, whereby the Judgment of our Church is to be taken? Are not our Articles as easy to be had and understood, as the Decrees and Canons of the Council of *Trent*? I will not ask, How the Council of *Trent* comes to be the Rule and Measure of Doctrine to any here, where it was never received? [illegible] may, why our Representations are not to be taken from the Sense of our Church, as their's from the Council of *Trent*? If he saith, *his Design was to re-move common Prejudices, and vulgar Mistakes*; it is easy to answer, If they are contrary to the Doctrine of our Church, we utterly disown them. We know very well there are Persons, who have so false a Notion of *Popery*, that they charge the Rites and Customs of our Church with it: but we pity their Weakness and Folly, and are far from defending such Misrepresentations. But that which we adhere to, is the Doctrine and Sense of our

Church

Church, as it is by Law eſtabliſhed; and what Repreſentations are made agreeable thereto, I undertake to defend, and no other. But if a Perſon take the liberty to lay on what Colours he pleaſes on one ſide, it will be no hard matter to take them off in the other, and then to ſay, *How much fairer is our Church than ſhe is painted!* It is an eaſy, but not ſo allowable a way of diſputing, for the ſame Perſon to make the Objections and Anſwers too; for he may ſo model and frame the Arguments by a little Art, that the Anſwers may appear very full and ſufficient; whereas if they had been truly repreſented, they would be found very lame and defective.

2. He pretends to give an Account why he quotes no Authors for his Miſrepreſentations, which is very unſatisfactory, *viz. That he hath deſcribed the Papiſt therein, exactly according to the apprehenſion he had of him when he was a Proteſtant.* But how can we tell what ſort of Proteſtant he was; nor how well he was inſtructed in his Religion? And muſt the Character now ſuppoſed to be common to Proteſtants, be taken from his ignorant, or childiſh, or wilful Miſtakes? Did ever any Proteſtant, that underſtands himſelf, ſay, *That Papiſts are never permitted to hear Sermons which they are able to underſtand,* (p. 58.) *or that they held it lawful to commit Idolatry,* (p. 9.) Or, *that a Papiſt believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels,* &c. Yet theſe are ſome of his Miſrepreſentations, (*p.* 40.) Did he in earneſt think ſo himſelf? If he did, he gives no good account of himſelf: if he did not, he gives a worſe; for then how ſhall we believe him in other things, when he ſaith, *He hath drawn his Miſrepreſentations exactly, according to his own Apprehenſions?* It is true, he ſaith, *he added ſome few Points, which were violently charged on him by his Friends:* but we dare be bold to ſay, theſe were none of them. But let us ſuppoſe it true, that he had ſuch Apprehenſions himſelf. Are theſe fit to be printed as the Character of a Party? What would they ſay to us, if a Spaniſh Convert ſhould give a Character of *Proteſtants*, according to the common Opinion the People there have of them; and ſet down in one Column their monſtrous Miſrepreſen-

tations, and in another, what he found them to be ſince his coming hither; and that in good Truth he ſaw they were juſt like other Men? But ſuppoſe he had falſe Apprehenſions before he went among them; why did he not take care to inform himſelf better before he changed? Had he no Friends, no Books, no Means to rectify his Miſtakes? Muſt he needs leave one Church, and go to another, before he underſtood either? If this be a true Account of himſelf, it is but a bad Account of the Reaſons of his Change.

3. The Account he gives of the other Part of his Character, affords as little ſatisfaction: For although in the general, it be well that he pretends to keep to a Rule; yet,

(1.) He ſhews no Authority he hath to interpret that Rule in his own ſenſe. Now ſeveral of his Repreſentations depend upon his own private Senſe and Opinions, againſt the Doctrine of many others as zealous for their Church as himſelf; and what reaſon have we to adhere to his Repreſentations rather than to theirs? As for inſtance, he ſaith, *The Pope's Perſonal Infallibility is no Matter of Faith*, (p. 42.) But there are others ſay it is, and is grounded on the ſame Promiſes which makes him Head of the Church. Why now muſt we take his Repreſentation rather than theirs? And ſo as to the *Depoſing Power*, he grants, *it hath been the Opinion of ſeveral Popes* (and Councils too) *but that it is no Matter of Faith*, (p. 47.) But whoſe Judgment are we to take in this Matter, according to the Principles of their Church? A private Man's, of no Name, no Authority, or of thoſe Popes and Councils who have declared it, and acted by it? And can any Man of their Church juſtify our relying upon his Word, againſt the Declaration of Popes and Councils? But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be about the Senſe of his own Rule, *the Council of Trent*: What Authority hath he to declare it, when the Pope hath expreſly forbidden all Prelats to do it, and reſerved it to the Apoſtolical See?

Bulla *Pii 4ti* ſuper Confirmat. Concil. Tridentini.

(2.) He leaves out, in the ſeveral Particulars, an eſſential part of the Character of a *Papiſt* ſince the Council of *Trent*;

Trent; which is, that he doth not only believe the Doctrines there defined to be true, but to be neceſſary to Salvation. And there is not a word of this in his Repreſentation of the Points of Doctrine, but the whole is managed, as though there were nothing but a difference about ſome particular Opinions; whereas in Truth, the Neceſſity of holding thoſe Doctrines, in order to Salvation, is the main Point in difference. If Men have no mind to believe their own Senſes, we know not how to help it; but we think it very hard to be told, we cannot be ſaved unleſs we renounce them too. And this now appears to be the true State of the Caſe, ſince *Pius* the 4*th* drew up and publiſhed a Confeſſion of Faith, according to the Decrees and Canons of the Council of *Trent*, wherein Men are not only required *to believe their Traditions as firmly as the Bible, the Seven Sacraments, Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Worſhipping of Images, Indulgences, Supremacy*, &c. but they muſt believe, *that without believing theſe things, there is no Salvation to be had* in the ordinary Way; for after the enumeration of thoſe Points, it follows, *Hanc veram Catholicam fidem extra quàm nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt*, &c. *This is the true Catholick Faith, without which no Man can be ſaved*; *i. e.* The belief of theſe things is thereby declared as neceſſary to Salvation, as of any other Articles of the Creed. But it may be objected, *The ſubſcribing this Profeſſion of Faith, is not required of all Members of that Church.* To which I anſwer, That to make a Man a Member of it, he muſt declare that he holds the ſame Faith which the Church of *Rome* holds: And this is as much the Faith of the Roman Church, as the Pope and Council of *Trent* could make it. And it is now printed in the Roman *Ritual* at *Paris*, ſet forth by *Paul* the 5*th*, as the Confeſſion of Faith owned by the Church of *Rome*. And therefore this ought to have been a part of the true Repreſentation, as to the Doctrinal Points; but when he comes to the 35*th* Head, he then owns, *That unleſs Men do believe every Article of the Roman Faith, they cannot be ſaved*, (p. 96.) *and he that diſbelieves one, does in a manner diſbelieve all*, (p. 97.) Which may as well reach thoſe who diſown

the Deposing Power, and the Pope's personal Infallibility, as Us, since those are accounted Articles of Faith by the ruling part of their Church, to whom it chiefly belongs to declare them; and the former hath been defined both by Popes and Councils.

(3.) He never sets down what it is which makes my Doctrine to become a Doctrine of their Church. We are often blamed for charging particular Opinions upon their Church; but we desire to know what it is which makes a Doctrine of their Church; *i.e.* whether frequent and publick Declaration, by the Heads and Guides of their Church, be sufficient or not to that End? Our Author seems to imply the Necessity of some Conditions to be observed; for besides *the Pope's Authority*, he requires, *due Circumstances, and proceeding according to Law*, (p. 42.) But who is to be Judg of these Circumstances, and legal Proceedings? And he never tells what these *Circumstances* are. And yet after all, he saith, *The Orders of the Supream Pastor are to be obey'd, whether he be infallible or not.* And this now brings the Matter home; *The Popes*, he confesses, *have owned the Deposing Doctrine, and acted according to it*: And others are bound to obey their Orders, whether infallible or not; and consequently they are bound by the Doctrine of their Church to act, when the Popes shall require it, according to the Deposing Power. But he seems to say, in this Case, that a Doctrine of their Church is to be judged by the Number; for, saith he, *There are greater Numbers that disown this Doctrine*, (p. 47.) I will not at present dispute it; but I desire to be informed, Whether the Doctrines of their Church go by majority of Votes, or not? I had thought the Authority of the Guides of the Church, ought to have over-ballanced any Number of Dissenters. For, what are those who refuse to submit to the Dictates of Popes and Councils, but Dissenters from the Church of *Rome*? The distinction of the *Court and Church of Rome*, is wholly impertinent in this Case. For, we here consider not the meer Temporal Power which makes the Court, but the Spiritual Capacity of Teaching the Church; and if Popes and Councils may err in Teaching this Doctrine, why not in any other? I know

there

there are ſome that ſay, *Univerſal Tradition is neceſſary to make a Doctrine of their Church.* But then no ſubmiſſion can be required to any Doctrine in that Church, till the Univerſal Tradition of it, in all Times, and in all Parts of the Chriſtian Church, be proved. And we need to deſire no better Terms than theſe, as to all Points of Pope *Pius* the *4th* his Creed, which are in diſpute between us and them.

(4.) He makes uſe of the Authority of ſome particular Divines, as delivering the Senſe of their Church, when there are ſo many of greater Authority againſt them. Whereas, if we proceed by his own Rule, the greater Number is to carry it. Therefore we cannot be thought to *miſrepreſent* them, if we charge them with ſuch things as are owned, either by the general and allowed Practices of their Church, or their Publick Offices, or the generality of their Divines and Caſuiſts; or in caſe of a Conteſt, with that ſide which is owned by the Guides of their Church, when the other is cenſured; or which was approved by their Canonized Saints, or declared by their Popes and Councils, whoſe Decrees they are bound to follow. And by theſe Meaſures I intend to proceed, having no deſign to *miſrepreſent them*, as indeed we need not.

And ſo much in Anſwer to the *Introduction.*

I. *Of Praying to Images.*

IN this, and the other Particulars, where it is neceſſary, I ſhall obſerve this Method;

1. To give a clear and impartial Account of the State of the Controverſy in as few words as I can.

2. To make ſome Reflections on what he ſaith, in order to the clearing them from Miſrepreſentations.

As to the ſtate of this Controverſy, as it ſtands, ſince the Council of *Trent*, we are to conſider.

1. We muſt diſtinguiſh between what Perſons do in their own Opinion, and what they do according to the Senſe of the Divine Law. It is poſſible that Men may intend one thing, and the Law give another Senſe of it: as is often ſeen in the Caſe of Treaſon; although the Perſons plead never ſo much they had no intention to commit Treaſon, yet if the Law makes their Act to be ſo, their diſavowing it doth not excuſe them. So it is in the preſent Caſe; Men may have real and ſerious Intentions, to refer their final, ultimate, and Soveraign Worſhip only to God; but if the Law of God ſtrictly and ſeverely prohibits this particular Manner of Worſhip by Images, in as full, plain, and clear Words as may be, and gives a Denomination to ſuch Acts, taken from the immediate Object of it; no particular Intention of the Perſons can alter that Denomination, or make the Guilt to be leſs than the Law makes it.

2. There can be no *Miſrepreſenting* as to the lawfulneſs of many External Acts of Worſhip, with reſpect to Images, which are owned by them. But it doth not look fairly to put the Title, *Of Praying to Images*; for the Queſtion is, *about the Worſhip of Images:* whereas this Title would inſinuate, as though we did directly charge them with *Praying to their Images, without any farther Reſpect.* Which we are ſo far from charging them with, that I do not know of any People in the World, who are not like *Stones and Stocks* them-

themſelves, who are liable to that Charge. The *PENDETS* in the *Eaſt-Indies* are fully cleared from it, by *Thevenot*, as well as *Bernier*. And it would be hard we ſhould not allow the ſame to our Fellow-Chriſtians. I do therefore grant what our Author ſaith, *viz. That all the Veneration they expreſs before Images, whether by kneeling, praying, lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incenſe, &c. is not at all done for the Image, but is wholly referr'd to the things repreſented, which he intends to honour by theſe Actions.* But I hope now, it is no Miſrepreſenting for us to ſay, that *they do kneel, pray, lift up their Eyes, burn Candles, Incenſe, &c. before their Images*; which is all I charge them with at preſent.

Thevenot *Voyage des Indes. p.* 188.

Bernier *Memoirs. Tom.* 3. *p.* 172.

Pag. 3.

3. To perform theſe Acts before Images, without a deſign to worſhip the Images by them, is declared, by great Divines of the Church of *Rome*, to be next to Hereſy. The Caſe was this; There were before the Council of *Trent*, ſeveral Perſons who lived in Communion of that Church, but by no means approved the Worſhip of Images, ſuch as *Durandus*, *Holcot*, *Picus Mirandula*, and others. Now theſe Perſons thought fit to comply in theſe External Acts, but declared they intended not to worſhip the Images, but the Objects before them. Since the Council of *Trent* decreed Images were to be worſhipped, this Caſe hath been debated by the Divines and Caſuiſts of greateſt Reputation among them; And *Suarez* ſaith, *This way of Durandus is dangerous, raſh, and ſavours of Hereſy*; and he ſaith further from *Medina*, *That it was* Victoria's *Opinion, that it was Heretical*; but he adds, that his own Opinion, *that Images were truly and properly to be worſhipped, was generally received by their Divines:* and therefore I need name no more.

Suarez *in* 3. *part, Qu.* 25. *Diſp.* 53. *Sect.* 3. 2*do. principaliter & Sect.* 5.

4. It is granted by their Divines and Caſuiſts, that the People in the Worſhip of Images, may eaſily fall into Idolatry.

(1.) If the Worſhip do not paſs from the Image to the Thing repreſented. And ſo *Aquinas* himſelf determines, That no Irrational Creature is capable of Worſhip, but as it hath Reſpect to a Rational Being. But here lies the Difficulty,

Difficulty, how an Extrinſecal Relation to an Object of Worſhip, where the Thing is confeſſed to deſerve none, can give any Reaſon, for its being properly worſhipped. But they all grant, if the Worſhip ſtop at the Inanimate part, it can be no other than the Worſhip of Stocks and Stones.

(2.) If the Worſhip be given to the Image, which is proper to God alone. This *Bellarmin* is forced to grant, because the Evidence is ſo clear in Antiquity, that the *Gnoſticks* were condemned for ſome Worſhip which they performed to the Image of Chriſt. Now, we cannot think that theſe *Gnoſticks* were ſuch Sots, as to take the Image of Chriſt to be Chriſt himſelf; and therefore what-ever Worſhip it was, it muſt be Relative, *i. e.* given to the Image for the ſake of Chriſt repreſented by it.

Bellarmin. *de Imag. l. 2. c. 24.*

Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 25.

(3.) *If the People believe any Divinity to be in the Images, or put any Truſt or Confidence in them*, then the Council of *Trent* it ſelf owns ſuch to be like the Heathen Idolaters. Now, how ſhall it be known when the People believe Divinity to be in Images, but by ſome more than ordinary Preſence or Operation in or by them? by their having a greater Opinion of one Image than of another of the ſame Perſon? by their going long Pilgrimages to certain Images, in hopes of Relief, when they might eaſily cauſe Images to repreſent at home?

And that ſuch are no extravagant Imaginations, is known to all who have heard of *Loretto*, or *Compoſtella*, or other Places nearer home. I need not mention the Complaints of *Polydore Virgil*, *Caſſander*, or *Wicelius*, to this purpoſe, who all died in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*; for the ſame is very lately complained of by a Conſiderable Perſon in that Communion, who ſaith, *The greateſt part of the Devotion of the People of* Italy, Spain, *and* Portugal, *conſiſts in proſtrating themſelves before Images, and going in Pilgrimage to them, and hoping for Remiſſion of their Sins by ſo doing.* And another very lately yields, *That to avoid the peril of Idolatry to which* (he ſaith) *the People is evidently expoſed by the uſe of Images, it would be neceſſary to take them away from the Altars, and by no means to have them allowed for the Objects of Religious Worſhip.*

Moyens Surs & honeſtes pour la Converſion de tous les Heretiques. To. 2. p. 115.

Entretiens de Philalethe & Philerene. 2d part, p. 157.

The

The Question now is, Whether the Council of *Trent* hath taken any effectual Course to prevent these *Abuses?* If not, what *Misrepresenting* is it to charge the Abuses upon the Doctrines and Practices allowed by it?

The Remedies prescribed by the Council, are these;

1. *Declaring that there is no Divinity or Vertue in them for which they should be worshipped; and that nothing is to be desired of them, or any Trust or Confidence to be put in them.*

2. *Expressing their earnest desire, that if any Abuses have crept in, they may be removed.*

But in the mean time the Council decrees, *the Images not only to be useful to be set up in Churches, but to have due Honour and Worship given them there, for the sake of those they represent; as not only putting off the Hat, but falling down before them.* And the *Roman Catechism* declares, *That this Worship is very beneficial to the People, and so much is to be told them; and that Images are to be in Churches, not meerly for Instruction, sed ut colantur*, that they may be worshipped. *Catechis. Rom. Part 3. c. 2. §. 14.*

But what could the Council do more, than to desire all Abuses may be taken away? and is it not then the fault of others, and not of the Council if they be not?

I grant, the Council doth desire *Abuses may be taken away, if any such be*; but then it enumerates those Abuses, in *Heterodox Images, in making Gain of Images, in painting them too wantonly*; but besides, it doth say, *that all Superstition be removed in the Sacred Use of Images*; but it doth not say in *the Worship of them*; and so it may relate to *Magick* and *Divination*. But that the Council could not prevent, or design to prevent the *Abuses* mention'd in the Worship of Images, will appear by these things.

1. The Council of *Trent* allows the highest Relative Worship to be given to them; it setting no bounds to it, so it be for the sake of the Prototypes.

2. It allows a Worship to be given to the Images themselves too; for it confirms the second Council of *Nice*, which decreed an inferiour Adoration to be given to them.

3. It disapproves no Customs then practised among them in the Worship of Images; which were all known, and by many complained of, both as Pilgrimages to them, and the carrying of them about in Procession, and the solemn Consecration of them; the Form whereof is not only inserted, but inlarged in the new Pontifical since the Council of *Trent*. And it is to be observed, that in the old Pontifical, *A. D.* 1511. there is no Form for consecrating an Image: in that of *Paul* the 3*d*, it is inserted, but out of *Durandus*; but in that of *Clement* the 8*th*, it is put in more largely, and as authentically as if it had been always there. And is not this the way to reform the Worship of Images?

To come now to our Author's Reflections on the *Misrepresentation* he saith hath been made as to this Point.

1. *A Papist represented, believes it damnable to worship Stocks and Stones for Gods; to pray to Pictures or Images of Christ, the Virgin* Mary, *or any other Saints.*

These Expressions are capable of a double Sense, and therefore this is not fair Representing.

(1.) *To worship Stocks or Stones for Gods*, may signify two things. (1.) To believe the very Stocks and Stones to be Gods. And this we do not charge them with. (2.) To give to Images made of Wood and Stone, the Worship due only to God; and so by construction of the Fact, to make them *Gods*, by giving them *Divine Worship*. And if they will clear themselves of this, they must either prove that *External Adoration* is no part of Divine Worship, (notwithstanding the Scripture makes it so, and all the rest of Mankind look upon it as such, even Jews, Turks, and Infidels;) or that their external Adoration hath no respect to the Images (which is contrary to the Council of *Trent*;) or that Divine Worship being due to the Being Represented, it may be likewise given to the Image. And how then could the *Gnosticks* be condemned for giving Divine Worship to the Image of Christ, which *Bellarmine* confesses; and is affirmed by *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Augustine*, and *Damascen*?

(2.) *To pray to Images of Christ, or the Blessed Virgin*, may likewise be taken in two senses. (1.) To pray to them,

them, ſo as to expect to be heard by the meer Images, and ſo we do not charge them with it. (2.) To pray to them, ſo as to expect to be rather heard by themſelves for praying to them by their Images. And if this be not ſo; to what end are the Prayers made in the Conſecration of Images, for thoſe that ſhall pray before them? To what purpoſe do ſo many go in long Pilgrimages to certain Images, if they do not hope to be better heard for praying there?

But he goes on; 2. *He keeps them by him indeed, to keep in his mind the memory of the things repreſented by them.* And is this all in good Truth? We will never quarrel with them, if this be true repreſenting. No, that he dares not ſay.

But, 3. *He is taught to uſe them,* p. 2. But how? *by caſting his Eye upon the Pictures or Images, and thence to raiſe his Heart to the Prototypes.* And is this all yet? No.

But, 4. He finds a double conveniency in the uſe of them. (1.) *They repreſent at one glance*; and Men may eaſily make good Reflections, as *upon the ſight of a Death's Head, or old* Time *painted with his Fore-lock, Hour-glaſs, and Syth.* And will he undertake that Images ſhall be uſed in Churches for no other end? Was the Picture of old *Time* ever *Conſecrated,* or placed upon the *Altar*, or elſewhere, *that it might be worſhipped?* as the *Roman* Catechiſm ſpeaks of their Images. (2.) *They cure Diſtractions; for they call back his wandring Thoughts to the Right Object.* What is this *Right Object?* the Image, or the Perſon repreſented? And that muſt be either a Creature, or God himſelf. If it be a Creature, doth not this imply that it is made a *Right Object of Worſhip?* If God himſelf; how doth an Image cure our Diſtraction, in the Worſhip of an Infinite Inviſible Being; when the very Image is moſt apt to diſtract our Thoughts, by drawing them down from his Divine and Adorable Perfections, to the groſs and mean Repreſentations of an Image? But are we yet come to the utmoſt uſe of them? No.

But, 5. *He cannot but love, honour, and reſpect the Images themſelves, for the ſake of thoſe they repreſent.* Will this content them, and will he promiſe to go no further? It is hard to part upon Terms of *meer Reſpect and Decent Regard,* where there is no encroachment upon *Divine Worſhip.* And here we are at a ſtand.

But he goes further. 6. And ſo he is come at laſt, *to Veneration before Images.* And is this all? Dares he deny *Veneration to Images*, when the Council of *Trent* hath determined it? *Eiſq; venerationem impartiendam?* What, is this Veneration *before Images* only? *Bellarmine* hath a Chapter on purpoſe to prove, that *true and proper Worſhip is to be given to Images.* And was he a *Miſrepreſenter? Suarez* ſaith, *It is an Article of Faith, that Worſhip is to be given to them.* But if the Veneration be only before them, why are they Conſecrated, and ſet up in Places proper for Adoration?

But, 7. *To ſatisfy any one that he is far from making Gods of his Images, he is ready to break them into a thouſand pieces.* What, a Conſecrated Image? Dares he take a Crucifix from the Altar and tear it in pieces? This doth not look like *the Love, Honour, and Reſpect* he mentioned before, not to name *Veneration.* And I am afraid this is a ſtrain beyond true Repreſenting: Yet at length he hath found ſome pretty Parallels for the *Veneration of Images* themſelves; and ſo we are come at laſt to the main Point. But this is not directly owned; yet in the way of his Repreſenting, it is fairly inſinuated by his Parallels.

1. *A Chriſtian loves and honours his Neighbour, becauſe he bears the Image of God in his Soul.* But doth he therefore take him and ſet him before him when he kneels at his Devotion, to raiſe his Mind, and cure his Diſtractions? Would he ſet him upon the Altar, and burn Incenſe before him, becauſe of the Image of God in him? Is there no difference between the *Object of Chriſtian Love*, and of *Divine Worſhip?* Nor between a Spiritual Inviſible Divine Image in the Souls of Men, and a Material and Corporeal Repreſentation?

2. *We may kiſs and eſteem the Bible, becauſe it contains and repreſents to Us God's Word.* But when we kiſs and eſteem the Bible, we remember the ſecond Commandment is in it; and we dare not break his Law, when we pretend to honour his Word. But we think there is ſome difference between *Reverence* and *Reſpect* to the *Bible*, and *falling down* before an Image. The Circumſtances of the one declare it to be meer *Reſpect*, and a *Religious Decency*; and if the other be not *External Adoration*, we know not what it is.

3. *A*

3. *A good Preacher is loved, because he minds Men of their Duty.* But what should we say to him that should therefore *kneel down and say his Prayers, and burn Candles and Incense before him*, out of a respect to his good Doctrine? Did S. *Peter*, or S. *Paul* like this, when Men would have worshipped them? A good Preacher would tell them of their Duty, as they did; and take Men off from the Worship of any Creature, animate or inanimate, and direct them to worship God alone, who made Heaven and Earth.

II. *Of Worshipping Saints.*

FOR the clear stating this Controversy, these things are to be premised.

1. We do not charge them, *that they make Gods of dead Men, i. e.* that they believe the Saints to be Independent Deities. For this our Author confesses *were a most damnable Idolatry.*

2. We do not say, that the State of the Church of *Rome*, with respect to the Worship of dead Men, is as bad as Heathenism. For we acknowledg the true Saints and Martyrs to have been, not only Good and Vertuous, but Extraordinary Persons, in great Favour with God, and highly deserving our Esteem and Reverence, as well as Imitation; whereas the Heathen Deified Men, were vile and wicked Men, and deserved not the common Esteem of Mankind, according to the Accounts themselves give of them. And we own the common Doctrine and Advantages of Christianity to be preserved in the Church of *Rome*.

3. We do not deny, that they do allow some external Acts of Worship to be so proper to God alone, that they ought to be given to none else besides him. And this they call *Latria*; and we shall never dispute with them about the proper signification of a Word, when the Sense is agreed, unless they draw Inferences from it, which ought not to be allowed. To this *Latria*, they refer not only Sacrifice, but all

all that relates to it, as Temples, Altars, and Priests: so that by their own Confession, to make these immediately and properly to the Honour of any Saint, is to make a God of that Saint, and to commit Idolatry.

4. They confess, that to pray to Saints to bestow Spiritual or Temporal Gifts upon us, were to give to them the Worship proper to God, who is the only giver of all good Things. For else I do not understand, why they should take so much pains to let us know, that whatever the Forms of their Prayers and Hymns are, yet the Intention and Spirit of the Church, is only to desire them to pray for us, and to obtain things for us by their Intercession with God.

But two things cannot be denied by them.

1. That they do use solemn Invocation of Saints in Places of Divine Worship, at the same time they make their Addresses to God himself, with all the Circumstances of External Adoration, with bended Knees, and Eyes lifted up to Heaven; and that this Practice is according to the Council of *Trent*, which not only decrees an humble Invocation of them, but declares it to be impiety to condemn mental and vocal Supplication to the Saints in Heaven. Sect. 25.

2. That they do own making the Saints in Heaven to be their Mediators of Intercession, but not of Redemption; although Christ be our Mediator in both senses.

And upon these two Points this Controversy depends.

Let us now see what our *Representer* saith to them.

Pag. 4. 1. *His Church teaches him indeed, and he believes that it is good and profitable, to desire the Intercession of the Saints reigning with Christ in Heaven; but that they are either Gods, or his Redeemers, he is no where taught, but detests all such Doctrine.*

There are two ways of *desiring the Intercession of others for us.*

1. By way of *Friendly Request*, as an Act of mutual Charity; and so, no doubt, we may desire others here on Earth to pray for us.

2. By

2. By way of *Humble Supplication*, with all the external Acts of Adoration: and we cannot think S. *Peter*, or S. *Paul*, who refuſed any thing like *Adoration* from Men, would have been pleaſed to have ſeen Men fall down upon their Knees before them; and in the ſame poſture of Devotion in which they were praying to Almighty God, to put their Names into the middle of their *Litanies*, and ſo pray them then to pray for them.

But how are we ſure that their Church teaches no more than this? I have read over and over the Council of *Trent*, and the *Roman Catechiſm* about it, and I can find no ſuch limitation of their ſenſe there, where, if any where, it ought to be found. The Council of *Trent* mentions both the *Prayers*, and *the Help and Aſſiſtance* of the Saints which they are to fly to. If this *Help* and *Aſſiſtance* be no more than their *Prayers*, why is it mentioned as diſtinct? Why is *their reigning together with Chriſt in Heaven* ſpoken of, but to let us underſtand they have a Power to *Help* and *Aſſiſt*? For what is their Reigning to their Praying for us? But I have a further Argument to prove the Council meant more, *viz.* the Council knew the common Practices and Forms of Invocation then uſed and allowed, and the general Opinion, that the Saints had power to Help and Aſſiſt thoſe who prayed to them. If the Council did not approve this, why did it inſert the very words upon which that Practice was grounded? They likewiſe very well knew the Complaints which had been made of theſe things; and ſome of their own Communion cried ſhame upon ſome of their Hymns. *Wicelius* ſaith, one of them, [*Salve Regina*, &c.] *is full of downright Impiety, and horrible Superſtition, and that others are wholly inexcuſable.* Wicel. *in Enchiridio Abuſuum.* *Lud. Vives* had ſaid, *He found little difference in the Peoples Opinion of their Saints in many things, from what the Heathens had of their Gods.* Vives *in Aug. de Civit. Dei. l. 8. c. 27.* Theſe things were known; and it was in their Power to have redreſſed them, by declaring what the Senſe of the Council was, and that whatever Forms were uſed, no more was to be underſtood by them, but *praying to them to pray for them.* Beſides, the Council of *Trent*, in the very ſame Seſſion, took care *about reforming the Miſſal and Breviary*; why was no care taken to reform

reform these *Prayers and Hymns*, which they say are not to be construed by *the Sense of the Words*, but by *the Sense of the Church?* There was time enough taken for doing it; for the *Reformed Missal* was not published till six Years after the *Council*, nor the *Breviary* till four. In all that time, the *Prayers* and *Hymns* might easily have been altered to the *Sense of the Church*, if that were truly so. But instead of that, a very late French Writer cries out *of the necessity of Reforming the Breviaries as to these things*; wherein he confesses, *Many Hymns are still remaining, wherein those things are asked of Saints, which ought to be asked of God alone; as being delivered from the Chains of our Sins, being preserved from Spiritual Maladies, and Hell Fire; being inflamed with Charity, and made fit for Heaven. In good Conscience*, saith he, *is not this joining the Saints with God himself, to ask those things of them which God alone can give?* And whatever Men talk of *the Sense of the Church*, he confesses *the very Forms, and natural Sense of the Words, do raise another Idea in Mens Minds; which ought to be prevented.*

Entretiens de Philalethe & Philerene. Part. 2. p. 160, 163, 165.

But doth not the Roman Catechism explain this to be the Sense of the Church? I have examined that too, with all the care I could, about this Matter. And I cannot find any necessity from thence of putting this Sense upon them. I grant in one place, where it explains *the difference of the Invocation of God and Saints*, it saith, *We are to pray to God as the Giver, and to Saints, that they would obtain things of God for us*; and then it adds, *the Forms differ, that to God is, Miserere Nobis, and Audi Nos*; that to Saints is, *Ora pro Nobis*. Very well! And is there then no other Form owned or allowed in the Church of *Rome* to Saints besides this? Hold a little, saith the *Catechism*, for *it is lawful to make use of another Form*; and that is, *we may pray to Saints too, Ut nostri misereantur*. And how doth this now differ from that to God, but only in Number? But it adds, *that the Saints are very pitiful*; then surely we are encouraged to pray to them for *help and pity*. *Yes*, saith the *Catechism*, *we may pray to them, that being moved with pity toward us, they would help us with their Favour and Intercession with God.* But yet this doth not clear the Matter; for elsewhere the *Roman Catechism*

Catech. Rom. Part 4. *c.* 6. *n.* 2, 3.

at-

attributes more to *Saints* than meer *Interceſſion*; and we may pray to them for what is in their power: For where it undertakes to give an exact Account of the Reaſon of *Invocation of Saints and Angels*; it there parallels them with *Magiſtrates under a King*, and ſaith, *they are God's Miniſters in governing the Church*; *Invocandi itaque ſunt quod & perpetuo Deum intuentur, & Patrocinium Salutis noſtræ libentiſſimè ſuſcipiunt.* What is this *Patrocinium ſalutis noſtræ?* Is it only *Praying and Interceſſion with God?* That cannot be; for it inſtances preſently in *deliverances by Angels, and* Jacob's *praying to the Angel to bleſs him*, and not meerly to intercede for him. *But though this is ſpoken of Angels*, yet from hence it infers *the Invocation of Saints* too. But what need we inſiſt more on this, ſince they do own the *Miniſtry of Saints* as well as Angels, with reſpect to the Church; and do *Canonize Saints* for particular Countries, as lately *St. Roſa* for *Peru.* And where there is ſuch a particular Protection ſuppoſed, what incongruity is it to interpret the Form of their Prayers, according to a Doctrine ſo received and allowed? But of this more under the next Head.

Catech. Rom. Part. 3. *c.* 2. *n.* 4, 6. *Cum præſint nobis Sancti & verum noſtrarum curam gerant.* Bellarm. *de Sanct. Beatit. l.* 1. *c.* 20. §. *deinde. Non ſolum ab Angelis ſed etiam à ſpiritibus beatorum hominum Regi & Gubernari fideles viventes. Id. ib. c.* 18. §. *nos autem.*

2. *He confeſſes that we are all redeemed by the Blood of Chriſt alone, and that he is our only Mediator of Redemption; but as for Mediators of Interceſſion, he doth not doubt but it is acceptable with God we ſhould have many.*

I would ask, concerning this Diſtinction, the Queſtion which *Chriſt* asked concerning *John's Baptiſm, Is it from Heaven, or of Man?* No doubt there may be ſuch a Diſtinction of *Mediators*, if God pleaſe to make them. But who hath Authority to appoint *Mediators* with him beſides himſelf? Is it not uſurping his Prerogative, to appoint the great Officers of his Kingdom for him? Would any Prince upon Earth allow this, *viz.* when he hath abſolutely declared his Pleaſure, that his own Son ſhould preſent Petitions to him, that others ſhould take upon them to ſet up Maſters of Requeſts themſelvs? Can any thing be plainer in the New Teſtament, than that God hath appointed the *Mediator* of *Redemption*, to be our *Mediator of Interceſſion*? And that his *Interceſſion* is founded upon his *Redemption*? As the *High Prieſt's*

John 14. 13, 14, 16, 23, 24. Heb. 7. 25. & 9. 7, 24. 1 John 2. 1.

Priest's going into the *Holy of Holies* to intercede for the People, was upon the *Blood of the Sacrifice of Expiation*, which he carried in with him. If there were no Revelation in this Matter, there might be some reason for it. But since the Revelation is so clear in it, this Distinction looks just like the *Socinians* Distinction of a *God by Nature*, and a *God by Office*; which was framed on purpose to avoid the plain Text of Scripture which called Christ *God*. So doth this look as if it were intended to avoid that clear Text, which
1 Tim. 2. 5. saith, *There is one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.* Which is presently answered with this Distinction; although there be not the least ground in that, or any other Text for it.

Yes, saith our Author, Moses *was such a Mediator for the Israelites*; Job *for his three Friends*; Stephen *for his Persecutors: The Romans were desired by S.* Paul *to be his Mediator, and the* Corinthians *and* Ephesians; *so almost every sick Person desires the Congregation to be his Mediator, that is, to be remembred in their Prayers.* P. 4, 5.

But is there no difference between Men praying for one another, and desiring others to pray for them here on Earth, and an *humble Invocation* of the *Saints in Heaven* to be our *Mediators* of *Intercession* with God there?

There is a threefold disparity in the Case.

1. Here upon Earth we must converse with one another as Fellow-Creatures, and there is no danger of our having an Opinion thereby, that we are able to assist one another any other way than by our Prayers. But the Case is very different as to the Saints in Heaven, who by being addressed to there by such solemn Invocation, may too easily be conceived to have the Power of bestowing such Blessings upon those who call upon them.

2. Heaven is look'd on by all Mankind who direct their Devotions thither, as the particular Throne of God, where he dwells, and discovers himself after another manner than he doth upon the Earth. And we are directed to pray to our *Father in Heaven*; where he is represented as infinitely above all his Creatures; and the great Concernment of Religion

gion is, to keep up the apprehenſion of this diſtance between him and them. Now it is hardly poſſible to keep it up, if in the Publick Offices of Religion, in the ſolemneſt poſtures of Devotion, with Eyes lifted up to Heaven, they do make Addreſſes, both to God and to his Creatures.

3. Men are ſure, when they pray to others on Earth to pray for them, that they do no more than they can juſtify in point of Diſcretion, when they ſpeak or write to thoſe that can underſtand what their deſire is: But no Man on Earth can be certain that the Saints in Heaven can do it: For it is agreed they cannot do it without Revelation, and no Man can be aſſured there is a Revelation; and it is not reaſonable to expect it; for they pray to Saints to pray to God for them, and they cannot tell what they pray for, unleſs God to whom they are to pray, reveal to them what it is they muſt pray unto him for. Is it not then the better, the ſafer, the wiſer way, to make our Prayers to him, who we are ſure is able to hear and help us; and hath promiſed to grant what we ask in his Son's Name? But there is no *other Name*, either *under Heaven*, or *in Heaven*, whereby *we can be ſaved*, or our Prayers accepted, but His alone.

But our Author ſaith, *It is no part of his Faith, how the Saints in Heaven know the Prayers and Neceſſities of ſuch who addreſs themſelves to them*, p. 5.

But how comes it to be any part of his Faith, that they know them? *However he doth not doubt but God can never want means of letting the Saints know them*, p. 6. And is this a ſufficient ground for ſolemn Invocation of Saints? God doth not want Means to let the Emperor of *Japan* know a Requeſt any one here hath to make to him; but is this a reaſonable Ground, for him at this diſtance to make it to him? God doth not want means to let the Pope know what a mighty Service it would be to the Chriſtian World, to make a wiſe and truly Chriſtian-Reformation in the Church; but would this be a Ground ſufficient for me at this Diſtance, to make a Speech to him about it? I knew a Man who underſtood not a word of Latin, but yet would needs go to hear a Latin Sermon: ſome asked him afterwards, what he meant by it? and the chief Reaſon he gave was much like

this, *God did not want Means to let him know what the Preacher meant.*

But after all; Suppoſe *God ſhould make known to the Saints what is deſired of them*: I ask, Whether this be a ſufficient Ground for ſolemn Invocation? When *Socinus* was not able to defend the *Invocation of Chriſt himſelf*, ſuppoſing that he could know our Hearts only by Revelation: and he had nothing material to ſay, but only that there was a Command for it; which can never be ſo much as pretended in this Caſe.

As to what he alleadges of the *Elders falling down before the Lamb, having Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayess of the Saints, Apoc.* 5. 8. It muſt be ſtrained hard to be brought to this purpoſe, when both Antient and Modern Interpreters take it for a Repreſentation of what was done upon Earth, and not in Heaven. And if it were in Heaven, Prophetical Viſions were never intended for a meaſure of our Duties. *If the Angels do pray for Mankind*, Zech. 1. 12. Doth it therefore follow we muſt pray to them? But we ſay, as the Angel did to S. *John*, Revel. 19.10. in a like Caſe, *See thou do it not: worſhip God.*

III. *Of Addreſsing more Supplications to the Virgin* Mary, *than to Chriſt.*

HEre is no need of farther ſtating the Queſtion; this only relating to the extraordinary Service of the Bleſſed Virgin. And therefore we are preſently to attend his Motions:

He believes it damnable to think the Virgin Mary *more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt, or that ſhe can in any thing command him.* p. 6.

But in good earneſt, is it not damnable, unleſs a Man thinks the Bleſſed Virgin *more powerful than Chriſt*? Suppoſe one ſhould think her to have *an equal ſhare of Power with Chriſt*; Is this damnable, or not? is it not ſetting up a Creature equal with God?

But

But what thinks he then of thoſe who have attributed an univerſal Dominion to her, over Angels, Men, and Devils? What thinks he not only of *Pſalters*, but of a *Creed*, *Litany*, and all the *Hymns* of *Scripture* being applied to her? All which was done by a Canonized Saint in their Church; and the Books printed out of the *Vatican* Manuſcripts, and dedicated to the Pope. And there we find ſomething more than an *Ora pro nobis* in the *Litany*; for there is *Parce nobis, Domina*, Spare us, good Lady: and *Ab omni malo, libera nos, Domina*: From all evil good Lady, deliver us.

S. Bonavent. *Opuſc. Tom.* 1. *ad fin.*

What thinks he of another Canonized Saint, who ſaid, theſe two Propoſitions are both true, *All things are ſubject to God's Command, even the Virgin*; and *all things are ſubject to the Command of the Virgin, even God.* Was this damnable in a Canonized Saint?

S. Bernardin. *Ser. apud Bernadin à Buſtis Marial.* Part 12. Serm. 2.

What thinks he of the noted Hymn?

O felix Puerpera noſtra pians ſcelera
Jure Matris impera Redemptori!

Was not this damnable? And I have not only ſeen it in the *old Paris Miſſal*, but *Balingham* a Jeſuit, ſaith, it was in the Miſſals of *Tournay*, *Liege*, *Amiens*, *Artois*, and the *Old Roman.* I could produce many other Paſſages cited by him out of the *old Offices* to the ſame purpoſe; but I forbear.

Balinghem. *Parnaſſ. Marian.* p. 208.

But I cannot omit the Approbation given to the blaſphemous ſaying of S. *Bernardin* by *Mendoza*, (who endeavours to prove *the bleſſed Virgin's Kingdom, not to be a Metaphorical, but a true and real Kingdom*). And by *Salazar*, another noted Jeſuit, who ſaith, *Her Kingdom is as large as her Son's.* And we have lately ſeen how far this Divinity is ſpread, for not many years ſince, this Propoſition was ſent from *Mexico*,

Mendoza. *Virid. Sacr. l.* 2. *Probl.* 1, & 4. Salazar. *pro Immac. Concept.* c. 22.

Filius non tantum tenetur audire Matrem, ſed & obedire;

Hier. Peres de Nuevos Lapidicina Sacra Tr. 1. *Sect.* 12. *N.* 148.

The Son is bound not only to hear, but to obey his Mother. And is it ſtill damnable for to ſay, *ſhe commands him?*

But

Page 7.

But our Author ſaith, What ever eſteem they have for her, *They own her ſtill as a Creature.* Is he ſure of that? What thinks he of another Saying, which *Mendoza* approves of, *viz.* of Chriſt's ſaying to his Mother, *As thou haſt communicated Humanity to me, I will communicate my Deity to thee?*

Viridar. Sacr. l. 2. Probl. 2. N. 11.

But it may be ſaid, *We are by no means to judg the ſenſe of a Church by ſome Mens extravagant ſayings.*

I grant it. But I have ſomething conſiderable to reply; *viz.* That we may eaſily judg which way the Guides of that Church incline, by this following paſſage: About ten years ſince a Gentleman of that Communion publiſhed a Book, called, *Wholſom Advice to the Worſhippers of the bleſſed Virgin*; and the whole deſign of it, being printed in Latine and French, was to bring the People of that Church to a bare *Oro pro nobis* to the *Bleſſed Virgin.* But this was ſo far from being approved, that the Book was condemned at *Rome*, and vehemently oppoſed by the Jeſuits in *France*; and a whole Volume publiſhed againſt it.

La veritable Devotion envers la S. Vierge Etable & Defendu par le Pere Craſſet à Paris, A. D. 1679.

Here I have reaſon to enquire, Whether the Virgin *Mary* then, according to the ſenſe of the Church of *Rome*, be only a *Mediatrix* of *Interceſſion* or not, ſince ſo large Power and Dominion is attributed to her? And why ſhould not her Suppliants go beyond an *Ora pro nobis*, if this Doctrine be received; as it muſt be, if the contrary cannot be endured? For that Author allowed her *Interceſſion* and *Prayer to her* on that account; but he found fault with thoſe who ſaid *ſhe had a Kingdom divided with her Son*; *that ſhe was the Mother of Mercy, or was a Co-Saviour, or Co-Redemptrix*; *or that ſhe was to be worſhipped with* Latria; *or that Men were to be Slaves to her.* Now, if theſe things muſt not be touched without Cenſure, and no Cenſure paſs on the other Books; is it not eaſy to judg which is more agreeable to the Spirit of the Guides of that Church?

Monita Salutaria B. V. Mariæ ad Cultores ſuos indiſcretos §. 3. n. 56. §. 4.

But we have a freſh Inſtance of this kind at home, in a Book very lately publiſhed, *Permiſſu Superiorum.* There we are told in the Epiſtle, That not only *the Bleſſed Virgin is the Empreſs of Seraphims — the moſt exact Original of Practical Perfection which the Omnipotency of God ever drew; but that*

Contemplations of the Life and Glory of Holy *Mary*, the Mother of Jeſus, *A. D.* 1685.

that by innumerable Titles ſhe claims the utmoſt Duty of every Chriſtian, as a proper Homage to her Greatneſs. What can be ſaid more of the Son of God in our Nature? In the Book it ſelf ſhe is ſaid to be *Queen of Angels, Patroneſs of the Church, Advocate of Sinners*; *that the Power of* Mary *in the Kingdom of Jeſus, is ſuitable to her Maternity, and other Priviledges of Grace: and therefore by it ſhe juſtly claims a Servitude from all pure Creatures.* But wherein doth this *ſpecial Devotion* to her conſiſt? He names ſeveral Particulars. Pag. 4. Pag. 8.

1. *In having an inward, cordial, and paſſionate value of the Maternity of* Mary, *and all other Excellencies proper to, and inſeparable from the Mother of God.*

2. *In External Acts of Worſhip, of eminent Servitude towards her, by reaſon of the Amplitude of her Power in the Empire of Jeſus.* And can we imagine theſe ſhould go no further, than a poor *Ora pro nobis?* He inſtances in theſe External Acts of her Worſhip. (1.) *Frequent viſiting Holy Places dedicated to her Honour.* And are not thoſe her Temples then? which *Bellarmine* confeſſeth to be a peculiar part of the Worſhip due to God. And the Diſtinction of *Baſilicæ* cannot hold here: becauſe he believes the Aſſumption of the Bleſſed Virgin; and he will not pretend *to her Honour* is only for Diſcrimination. (2.) *A ſpecial Reverence towards Images repreſenting her Perſon.* (3.) *Performing ſome daily Devotions containing her Praiſes, congratulating her Excellency, or imploring her Mediation; and by oft calling upon the Sacred Name of holy* Mary, *&c.* Bellarmin. *de Cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 4. init.*

3. *In having a firm and unſhaken Confidence in her Patronage amidſt the greateſt of our inward Conflicts, and outward Tribulations; through a ſtrong Judgment of her eminent Power within the Empire of Jeſus, grounded upon the ſingular Prerogative of her Divine Maternity.* I have not Patience to tranſcribe more, but refer the Reader to the Book it ſelf; only the eighth Particular of *ſpecial Devotion* is ſo remarkable, that it ought not to be paſſed over, *viz. Entring a ſolemn Covenant with Holy* Mary, *to be for ever her Servant, Client and Devote, under ſome ſpecial Rule, Society or Form of Life, and thereby dedicating our Perſons, Concerns, Actions, and all the Moments and Events of our Life to Jeſus, under the Protection* Pag. 12.

tection of his Divine Mother, chooſing her to be our Adoptive Mother, Patroneſs, and Advocate; and intruſting her with what we are, have, do, or hope, in Life, Death, and through all Eternity. And is all this no more than an *Ora pro nobis?* And
Pag. 14. it follows, *Put your ſelf wholly under her Protection.* What a pitiful thing was the old *Collyridian* Cake, in compariſon of theſe ſpecial Acts of Devotion to her! But there are ſome extraordinary ſtrains of Devotion afterwards, which it is pity to paſs over: As, *I will ever obſerve thee as my*
Pag. 22. *Soveraign Lady, Adoptive Mother, and moſt powerful Patroneſs; relying on thy Bowels of Mercy, in all my Wants, Petitions, and Tribulations of Body and Mind.* Could any thing greater be ſaid to the Eternal Son of God? And in the *Praiſe:*

Verſe. Open my Lips, O Mother of Jeſus.
Reſp. *And my Soul ſhall ſpeak forth thy Praiſe.*
Verſ. Divine Lady, be intent to my Aid.
Reſp. *Graciouſly make haſte to help me.*
Verſ. Glory be to Jeſus and *Mary.*
Reſp. *As it was, is, and ever ſhall be.*

Then follows the Eighth *Pſalm*, applied thus to her.

Pag. 24. Mary, *Mother of Jeſus, how wonderful is thy Name, even unto the Ends of the Earth!*

All Magnificence be given to Mary: *And let her be exalted above the Stars and Angels.*

Reign on high as Queen of Seraphims and Saints; and be thou crowned with Honour and Glory, &c.

Glory be to Jeſus and Mary, *&c.*

In the next Page follows a *Cantique*, in imitation of the *Te Deum.*

Pag. 25. *Let us praiſe thee, O Mother of Jeſus! Let us acknowledge thee our Soveraign Lady.*

Let Men and Angels give Honour to thee, the firſt conceived of all pure Creatures, &c.

I think I need mention no more; only three things I shall observe, (1.) That this is now printed *Permissu Superiorum*; and we thank them for the seasonableness of it, in helping us in *true Representing*, what their allowed Doctrines and Practices are. (2.) That this is published in English, that our People, as well as theirs, may be convinced how far we have been from unjust charging them as to such things as these. (3.) That at the same time they plead for keeping the Bible out of the hands of the People; wherein their Discretion is so far to be commended, since the Scripture, and this new Scheme of Devotion, can never stand together. There being not one word in the Bible towards it, but very much against it; and the Psalms and Hymns must be *burlesqu'd* to sound that way.

But what saith our Author to their *Rosaries*, wherein there are *ten Ave Maries to one Pater noster*; which is accounted a special piece of Devotion; and great things are said of the Effects of it by *Alanus de Rupe*, and many others?

1. As to the *Ave Maries*, he saith, *there is no more Dishonour to God in reciting the Angelical Salutation, than in the first pronouncing it by the Angel* Gabriel *and* Elizabeth. But it may not be altogether so pertinent. But doth he really think they said the whole *Ave Maria*, as it is used among them? Did the Angel and *Elizabeth* say, *Sancta Maria, Mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc & in hora mortis nostræ?* If not, to what purpose are they mentioned here? Pag. 7.

2. As *to the Repetition*; that, he saith, *is no more an idle Superstition, than* David's *repeating the same words* 26 *times in the* 136 *Psalm.* But what is this to the Question, *why more Supplications to the blessed Virgin, than to Christ?* And not one word of Answer is given to it. But *Alanus de Rupe* answers it roundly, *Because the blessed Virgin is our Mediatrix to Christ, the Mother of Mercy, and the special Patroness of Sinners.* This is indeed true representing. *Alanus de Rupe de usu Psalterii, l. 1. c. 6.*

IV. *Of paying Divine Worſhip to Reliques.*

FOR the right underſtanding this Controverſy, we are to conſider,

1. That there is a due Veneration to the Bodies of Saints and Martyrs, allowed on both ſides; and there is an undue Worſhip of them, which is diſowned on both ſides. The due Veneration is, a Religious Decency to be obſerved towards them; which lies in avoiding any thing like Contempt or Diſhonour to them, and uſing all ſuch Teſtimonies of Reſpect and Decency, which becomes the Remains of Excellent Perſons; provided we are ſatisfied of their Sincerity, without having recourſe to Divine Omnipotency to prove them: which *Ferrandus* the Jeſuit runs ſo much to, to prove the Truth of many Reliques, worſhipped in the Church of *Rome* in many places at once. But that it is poſſible to exceed in the Worſhip of true Reliques, even *Bellarmin* confeſſes, who ſays, *that God took away the Body of* Moſes, *leſt the People ſhould give Divine Worſhip to it.* And St. *Jerom* as hot as he was againſt *Vigilantius*, yet he utterly denied giving any Adoration to the Reliques of Martyrs. It ſeems then it is very poſſible to exceed that way.

Ferrandi. *Diſquiſitio Reliquiaria.*

De Imag. Sanct. l. 2. c. 4.

2. The Queſtion then is, Whether thoſe Acts of Worſhip which are allowed in the Church of *Rome*, do not go beyond due Veneration? For it is unreaſonable to ſuppoſe thoſe who give it, to believe thoſe Reliques to be Gods; and therefore it muſt be ſuch a Worſhip as is given to them, ſuppoſing them to be only Reliques of ſuch Perſons. The Council of *Trent* decrees Honour and Veneration to be given to them, but never determins what is due, and what not: it forbids all Exceſſes in drinking and eating, in the viſiting of Reliques; but not a word of Exceſſes in worſhipping of them, unleſs it be comprehended under the name of Superſtition. But *Superſtition* lies in ſomething forbidden, according to their notion of it: therefore, if there be no Prohibition

bition by the Church, there can be no Superſtition in the Worſhip of them. And if they had thought there had been any in the known Practices of the Church, they would certainly have mentioned them; and becauſe they did not, we ought in Reaſon to look on them as allowed. And yet not only *Caſſander* complains of the great Superſtition about them; but even the *Wallenbergii* lately confeſs, that the Abuſes therein, have not only been offenſive to us, but to themſelves too.

Caſſand. Conſult. Art. 21. *Tract. ſpecial* 4. *Controv.* 4.

But what ſaith our *Repreſenter* to them?

He believes it damnable to think there's any Divinity in the Reliques of Saints, or to adore them with Divine Honour. P. 7. But what is this adoring them with Divine Honour? A true Repreſenter ought to have told us what he meant by it, when the whole Controverſy depends upon it. Is it only ſaying Maſs to Reliques, or believing them to be Gods? Is there no giving Divine Honour by Proſtration, burning of Incenſe? *&c.* Nothing in expecting help from them? Yes, *If it be from any hidden Power of their own.* But here is a very hard Queſtion: If a Man doth not believe it to be an intrinſick Power in the Reliques, may a Man ſafely go to them, *Opis impetrandæ causâ*, as the Council of *Trent* ſaith, in hopes of Relief from them? Is it not poſſible for the Devil to appear with *Samuel*'s true Body, and make uſe of the Relique of a Saint to a very bad end? Then, ſay I, no Reliques can ſecure Men againſt the Impoſture of Evil Spirits, who, by God's Permiſſion, may do ſtrange things with the very Reliques of Saints.

But God hath viſibly worked by them, ſaith our Author, *by making them Inſtruments of many Miracles; and it is as eaſie for him to do it now.* P. 8, 9. This is the force of all he ſaith. To which I anſwer:

1. It is a very bold thing to call in God's Omnipotency, where God himſelf hath never declared he will uſe his Power; for it is under his own Command, and not ours. But there is no Reaſon to deduce the Conſequence of uſing it now, becauſe he hath done it formerly. And that they may not think this is cavilling in us, I deſire them to read *Pere Annat*'s Anſwer to the Janſeniſts pretended Miracle at

Rabat. Joy de Janſeniſt, A. D. 1656.

Port Royal, *viz.* of the Cure wrought by one of our Saviour's Thorns. There he gives another account of such Miracles than would be taken from us. But where he saith, *it is as much for the Honour of God's Name to work such Miracles now*; their own Authors will tell him the contrary; and that there is no such Reason now, as in former times, when Religion was to be confirmed by them; and when Martyrs suffered upon the sole account of the Truth of it; and therefore their Reputation had a great Influence upon converting the unbelieving World.

2. Suppose it be granted, yet it proves not any Religious Worship to be given to them. For I shall seriously ask an important Question: Whether they do really believe, any greater Miracles have ever been done by Reliques, than were done by the Brazen Serpent? And yet, although that was set up by God's own Appointment; when it began to be worshipped after an undue manner, it was thought fit by *Hezekiah* to be broken in pieces. What now was the undue Worship they gave to it? Did they believe the Serpent, which could neither move nor understand, was it self a God? *But they did burn Incense to it.* And did that make a God of it? Suppose Men burn Incense to Reliques; what then, are they made Gods presently? Suppose they do not, but place them upon Altars, carry them in Procession, fall down before them, with intention to shew the Honour they do them; are not these as much as burning a little Incense, which could not signify so much Honour as the other do? and it is hard then to make the one unlawful, and not the other.

V. *Of the Eucharist.*

THere are two material Points under this Head which are to be examined, because he endeavours to set them off with all the advantage he can, *viz.* Adoration of the Host, and Transubstantiation.

I. *Of*

I. *Of the Adoration of the Hoſt.*

1. The Queſtion is far enough from being, Whether it be lawful to commit Idolatry? as our *Repreſenter* puts it. For the *Miſrepreſenter* ſaith, *That a Papiſt believes it lawful to commit Idolatry:* and to clear this, our Author gravely ſaith, *He believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry*, pag. 9. As though any Men ever owned it to be lawful: Which is, as if the Queſtion were, Whether ſuch a Man committed Adultery, and he ſhould think to clear himſelf by ſaying, he believed it unlawful to commit Adultery.

2. The Queſtion is not, Whether Chriſt may be lawfully adored by us in the Celebration of the Euchariſt; which we are ſo far from denying, that our Church requires our receiving it in the poſture of Adoration.

3. The true Queſtion is, Whether the Body of Chriſt, being ſuppoſed to be preſent in the Hoſt by Tranſubſtantiation, be a ſufficient Ground to give the ſame Adoration to the Hoſt, which they would do to the Perſon of Chriſt?

And that this is the true ſtate of the Queſtion, will appear by theſe things.

1. The Council of *Trent* firſt defined Tranſubſtantiation, and from thence inferred *Adoration of the Hoſt*; as is moſt evident to any one that will read the fourth and fifth Decrees of the Thirteenth Seſſion: *Nullus itaque dubitandi locus*, &c. *i. e.* If Tranſubſtantiation be true, then Adoration follows. It's true, the ſixth Canon only ſpeaks of *Chriſt being there worſhipped*; but that ought to be compared with the firſt, ſecond, and fourth Canons, where the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is fully ſet down, as the Foundation of that *Adoration*.

2. The *Adoration* is not fixed on the *Perſon of Chriſt*, *as ſeparate from the Hoſt*, but as making *one Object* of Worſhip together with it. And ſo the Council of *Trent* declares in the ſixth Decree; when it ſaith, *The Sacrament is never the leſs to be adored, becauſe it was inſtituted to be received.* This cannot be otherwiſe underſtood, than as relating to the Sacrament: and ſo *that* what ever it be, muſt be granted to be

be the Object of Adoration. 'By the Sacrament, ſaith Car-
Pallaviein. *hiſt. Concil. Trident.* l. 12. c. 6. 'dinal *Pallavicini*, is underſtood the Object made up of the 'Body of Chriſt, and the Accidents. The Worſhip then being confeſſed to be Adoration, which is due to God alone, and that Adoration directed to the Sacrament as its proper Object; the Queſtion now is, Whether ſuch a Suppoſition in the Sacrament, doth juſtify that Adoration?

Our Author ſaith, *He accounteth it moſt damnable to worſhip or adore any breaden God, or to give Divine Honour to any Elements of Bread and Wine.* p. 9.

Then, I ſay, by his own confeſſion, if it be only Bread, he commits Idolatry; for the Adoration he cannot deny. But our *Repreſenter* loves ambiguous Expreſſions, which to the People ſound very well, but have no ſincere meaning: for what is it he underſtands by his *breaden God?* If it be that he worſhips a God which himſelf ſuppoſes to be nothing but Bread, we do not charge him with it; but if it be what we believe it to be, the Subſtance of Bread, but himſelf believes to be turned into the Body of Chriſt, then he cannot deny his Adoration to be given to it.

All that can excuſe them is, the Suppoſition; and whether that will or not, is now to be conſider'd.

1. If it be not true, themſelves grant it to be Idolatry.
Roſſenſ. c. Occolamp. l. 1. c. 2. *Coſter. Euchirid.* c. 8. n. 10. The Teſtimonies of Biſhop *Fiſher*, and *Coſterus*, are ſo well known to this purpoſe, that I ſhall not repeat them. And *Catharinus*, a Divine of Note in the Council of *Trent*, confeſſes it is Idolatry to worſhip an unconſecrated Hoſt, although the Perſon, through a Miſtake, believes it Conſecrated. And he quotes St. *Thomas* and *Paludanus* for his Opinion; and gives this Reaſon for it; *becauſe Chriſt is not worſhipped ſimply in the Sacrament, but as he is under the Species; and therefore if he be not ſo preſent, a Creature hath Divine Worſhip given it. As thoſe were guilty of Idolatry, who worſhipped any Creatures of old, ſuppoſing God to be there, as that he was the Soul of the World. They were not excuſed,* ſaith he, *that they thought they worſhipped but one God; becauſe they worſhipped him as preſent in ſuch a manner as he was not.* And this Book of his, he ſaith, in the Review of it, *was ſeen and approved by the Pope's Order, by their Divines at* Paris.
Catharin. in Cajet. p. 133, *&c. Ed. Paris.* 1535
Lugdan. 1542.

2. If

2. If *the Bread were taken to be God*, our Author doth not deny it would be Idolatry, for that were to worſhip a breaden God. Yet here would be a Miſtake, and a groſs one; yet this Miſtake would not excuſe the Perſons committing it from moſt damnable Idolatry, as he confeſſes: Why then ſhould the other Miſtake excuſe them, when they ſuppoſe the Subſtance of the Bread not to be there, but the Body of Chriſt to be under the Species? *Yes*, ſay they, *then no Creature is ſuppoſed to be the Object of Worſhip.* But when the Bread is ſuppoſed to be God, it muſt be ſuppoſed not to be a Creature. There is no Anſwer to be given in this Caſe, *but that the Bread really is a Creature, whatſoever they imagined*; and if this Miſtake did not excuſe, neither can the other.

II. *Of Tranſubſtantiation.*

Three Things our Author goes upon, with reſpect to this.

1. He ſuppoſes Chriſt's words to be clear for it.
2. He ſhews the poſſibility of it, from God's Omnipotency. P. 9, 10, 11, 12.
3. He argues againſt the Teſtimony or Evidence of Senſe or Reaſon in this Caſe, from ſome parallel Inſtances, as he thinks.

1. *He believes Jeſus Chriſt made his Words good, pronounced at his laſt Supper, really giving his Body and Blood to his Apoſtles; the Subſtance of Bread and Wine being, by his powerful Words, changed into his own Body and Blood; the Species only, or Accidents of the Bread and Wine, remaining as before. The ſame he believes of the Euchariſt conſecrated now by Prieſts.*

This is a very eaſy way, of taking it for granted that the words are clear for Tranſubſtantiation. And from no better Ground, to fly to God's Omnipotency to make it good, is as if one ſhould ſuppoſe Chriſt really to be turned into a Rock, a Vine, a Door; becauſe the words are every jot as clear, and then call in God's Omnipotency, which is as effectual to make them good. I confeſs, theſe words are ſo far from being clear to me for Tranſubſtantiation, that if I had

had never heard of it, I should never have thought of it, from these or any other words of Scripture, *i. e.* not barely considering the sound of words, but the Eastern Idioms of speaking; the Circumstances of our Saviour's real Body at that time when he spake them; the uncouth way of feeding on Christ's real Body, without any Objection made against it by his Disciples; the Key our Saviour elsewhere gives for understanding the manner of eating his Flesh; and withal, if these words be literally and strictly understood, they must make the Substance of Bread to be Christ's Body; for that is unavoidably the literal sense of the words. For can any Men take *This* to be any thing but this Bread, who attend to the common sense and meaning of Words, and the strict Rules of Interpretation? Yet this sense will by no means be allow'd; for then all that can be inferr'd from these words is, that when Christ spake these words, *The Bread was his Body.* But either Christ meant the *Bread* by *This*, or he did not; if he did, the former Proposition is unavoidable in the literal Sense; if he did not, then by virtue of these words, the Bread could never be turned into the Body of Christ. For that only could be made the Body of Christ which was meant, when Christ said, *This is my Body.* This seems to me to be as plain and convincing as any Demonstration in *Euclid.* Which hath often made me wonder at those who talk so confidently of the plain Letter of Scripture, being for this Doctrine of Transubstantiation. But several Divines of the Church of *Rome*, understood themselves better, and have confessed, That this Doctrine could not be drawn out of the literal sense of these words; as it were easy to shew, if it had not been lately done already. It is enough here to observe, that *Vasquez* confesseth it of *Scotus, Durandus, Paludanus, Ockam, Cameracensis*; and himself yields that they do not, and cannot signify expressly the Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body of Christ. For how can, *This is my Body*, literally signify, this is changed into my Body? If that Proposition were literally true, *This is my Body*, it overthrows the change; For how can a thing be changed into that which it is already?

Vasq. in 3 Part. Disc. 180. Q. 75. Art. 2. C. 5.

2. *He believes Christ being equal to his Father in Truth and Omnipotency, can make his Words good.* We do not in the least dispute

dispute Christ's Omnipotency, but we may their familiar way of making use of it to help them out, when Sense and Reason fail them. And therefore *Cajetan* well said; 'We 'ought not to dispute about God's Absolute Power in the 'Doctrine of the Sacraments, being things of such constant 'use; and that it is a foolish thing to attribute to the Sacra-'ment all that God can do.

Cajetan. in 3 Part. Q. 75. Art. 1, 2, 3.

But we must consider what he saith against *Sense and Reason. For the believing this Mystery, he does not at all think it meet for any Christian to appeal from Christ's Words, to his own Senses or Reason, for the examining the Truth of what he hath said, but rather to submit his Senses and Reason to Christ's Words in the obsequiousness of Faith.* What! whether we know this to be the meaning of Christ's Words, or not? And thus we shall be bound to submit to every absurd Interpretation of Scripture, because we must not use our Senses or Reason for examining the Truth of what is said there. Can any thing be plainer said in Scripture, than that God hath Eyes, and Ears, and Hands? Must now every Man yield to this *in the obsequiousness of Faith*, without examining it by Principles of Common Reason? And we think we are therefore bound to put another Sense upon those Expressions, because they imply a Repugnancy to the Divine Perfections. Why not then where something is implied which is repugnant to the Nature of Christ's Body, as well as to our Senses? But the Question about judging in this Matter by our Senses, is not, as our Author is willing to suppose, *viz.* Whether our Senses are to be believed, against a clear and express Divine Revelation; but whether the Judgment of our Senses and Reason is not to be made use of for finding out the true sense of this Revelation? And we think there is great reason for it.

(1.) Because we have no more certain way of judging the Substance of a Body, than by our Senses. We do not say our Senses go beyond the Accidents; but we say, our Senses, by those Accidents, do assure us of the bodily Substance, or else it were impossible for us to know there is any such thing in the World.

(2.) Because Christ did himself appeal to the Judgment of his Disciples Senses concerning the Truth of his own

S. Luk. 24. 39. Body after the Reſurrection; *Behold my Hands and my Feet, that it is I my ſelf: handle and ſee, for a Spirit hath not Fleſh and Bones, as ye ſee me have.* Now we think we have reaſon to allow the ſame *Criterion* which Chriſt himſelf did about the very ſame Body. Unleſs he had then told his Diſciples, that there was to be *another ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence* of the ſame Body, concerning which their Senſes were not to be Judges.

(3.) Some of the moſt important Articles of the Chriſtian Faith do ſuppoſe the Judgment of our Senſes to be true. As about the Truth of Chriſt's Body; whether he had really a Body, or only the outward Accidents and Appearance of a Body? if he had not, he did not really ſuffer upon the Croſs, and ſo the Sacrifice of Propitiation there offered up to the Father for the Sins of Mankind, is loſt. There was a great Controverſy in St. *John*'s time, and afterwards, Whether Chriſt had any real Body? Thoſe who denied it, brought Revelation for it; thoſe who aſſerted it, proved it by their
1 S. Joh. 1. 1, 3. Senſes, as S. *John* himſelf, *That which we have ſeen, and heard, and our hands have handled, &c.* He doth not tell Men, they muſt ſubmit their Senſe and Reaſon to the pretence of Revelation; but they ought to adhere to the Judgment of their Senſes concerning the Reality of Chriſt's Body. Since therefore Chriſt himſelf appealed to it, the Apoſtles made uſe of it, without any Caution or Limitation, we have great reaſon to rely ſtill on the Judgment of our Senſes concerning the ſame Object, *viz.* the Body of Chriſt.

3. But we muſt now conſider his Inſtances to overthrow the Judgment of our Senſes and Reaſon in this Point.

1. *He believes Chriſt to be God, though to Senſes he ſeemed nothing but Man.* Do we ever pretend to judg of Chriſt's Divinity by our Senſes? How then can this be pertinent, when our only Diſpute is about judging his Body, and the Subſtance of Bread and Wine by them? And yet the Senſes were of great uſe as to the proof of his Divinity by the Miracles which he wrought; which if they had been like the pretended Miracles in Tranſubſtantiation, could have convinced no Man, becauſe they could never ſee them.

2. *He believes the Holy Ghoſt deſcended on our Saviour, tho Senſes or Reaſon could diſcover it to be nothing but a Dove.* If

there

there were no reaſon to judg otherwiſe, the Judgment of Senſe were to be followed: But ſince the Scripture declares it was the Holy Ghoſt deſcending as a Dove, we have no reaſon to queſtion that Revelation. For we do not pretend that our Senſes are ſo far Judges of Divine Appearances, as to exclude the poſſibility of God's aſſuming the ſhape and figure of his Creature when he pleaſes, by moulding the Subſtance of a real Body into ſuch a Repreſentation. Thus we do not deny the poſſibility of an appearance of the Holy Ghoſt under Bread and Wine, if God thought fit, any more than under a Dove; and in this Caſe we do not pretend that our Senſes can exclude the preſence of a Spirit under the Elements; but that is very different from the preſent Caſe, for here the Subſtance is ſuppoſed to be gone, and nothing but Accidents remaining; and no ſpiritual Preſence of Chriſt is denied, but that of his Body, the very ſame Body which ſuffered on the Croſs.

3. *He believes the Man who appeared to* Joſhua, (*Ch.* 5. 13.) *and the three Men to* Abraham, (*Gen.* 18.) *were really and ſubſtantially no Men, notwithſtanding all the Information and Evidence of Senſe to the contrary, from their Colour, Features, Proportion, Talking, Eating, and many others.* And what follows from hence, but that Spiritual Inviſible Subſtances may be under the appearance of Bodies, and that our Senſes cannot be Judges of them? Which is not our Queſtion: but, Whether Bodies can be ſo preſent after the manner of Spirits, as to loſe all the natural Properties of Bodies? and, whether a Material Subſtance can be loſt, under all the Accidents proper to it, ſo as our Senſes cannot be proper Judges of one by the other?

But our Author ſeems to grant this, in a natural way of the Exiſtence of a Body: but he ſaith, *Chriſt gives to his Body a ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence, by which being left without extenſion of Parts, and rendred independent of Place, it may be one and the ſame in many Places at once, and whole in every part of the Symbols, and not obnoxious to any corporeal contingencies.* This is to me a Myſtery beyond all comprehenſion by Senſe or Reaſon; and there is certainly a great difference between governing our Underſtandings, and giving them up, as we muſt do if this Doctrine hold good; for it overthrows any

fixed Principles of Reaſon in Mankind concerning the Nature and Properties of Bodies.

For, 1. We muſt ſtill ſuppoſe the Body of Chriſt to be the very ſame individual Body which ſuffered upon the Croſs; but if it had no extenſion of Parts, and be reckoned independent upon Place, it ceaſeth to be a Body. It is granted, that after a natural way of Exiſtence, a Body cannot be in more Places than one: but let the way of Exiſtence be what it will, if it be a Body, it muſt be finite; if finite, it muſt be limited and circumſcribed; if it be circumſcribed within one place, it cannot be in more places, for that is to make it circumſcribed, and not circumſcribed; undivided from it ſelf, and divided from it ſelf at the ſame time. Which is a manifeſt Contradiction, which doth not depend only on Quantity or Extenſion, but upon the eſſential Unity of a Body.

2. If it be poſſible for a Body to be in ſeveral places by *a ſupernatural Exiſtence*; why may not the ſame Body be in ſeveral Places by *a Natural Exiſtence?* Is it not becauſe Extenſion and Circumſcription are ſo neceſſary to it, that in a natural Way it can be but in one Place? Then it follows that theſe are eſſential Properties of Bodies; ſo that no true Body can be conceived without them.

3. This *Supernatural Exiſtence* doth not hinder the Body's being individually preſent in one Place: My meaning is this; A Prieſt Conſecrates an Hoſt at *London*, and another at *York*; is the Body of Chriſt at *London*, ſo preſent there by virtue of Conſecration, as to be preſent at *York* too, by this *Supernatural Exiſtence?* What then doth the Conſecration at *York* produce? If it be not, then its Preſence is limited to the Hoſt, where the Conſecration is made; and if it be ſo limited, then this *Supernatural Exiſtence* cannot take off its Relation to Place.

4. The ſame Body would be liable to the greateſt Contradictions imaginable: For the ſame Body after this *ſupernatural way of Exiſtence*, may not only be above and below, within and without, near and far off from it ſelf: but it may be hot and cold, dead and alive; yea in Heaven and Hell at once.

5. What is it that makes it ſtill a Body after this *ſupernatural way of Exiſtence*, &c. if it loſe extenſion and dependency

dency on place? If it be only an aptitude to extenſion, when that *ſupernatural Exiſtence* is taken off, then it muſt either be without quantity, or with it. If it be without quantity, how can it be a Body? if with quantity, how is it poſſible to be without Extenſion?

6. This confounds all the differences of Greater and Leſs, as well as of Diſtance and Nearneſs. For upon this Suppoſition, a thing really greater may be contained within a leſs: for the whole Organical Body of Chriſt, with all its Part, may be brought within the compaſs of a Wafer; and the whole be in every part without any diſtance between Head and Feet.

7. This makes Chriſt to have but one Body, and yet to have as many Bodies as there are conſecrated Hoſts. No, ſaith our Author, *This ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence is without danger of multiplying his Body, or making as many Chriſts as Altars.* P. 11. But how this can be, is paſt all human Underſtanding: For every Conſecration hath its Effect, which is ſuppoſed to be the Converſion of the Subſtance of the Bread into the Body of Chriſt. Now, when a Prieſt at *London* converts the Bread into the Body of Chriſt there, he doth it not into the Body of Chriſt at *York*, but the Prieſt there doth it; therefore the Body of Chriſt at *London*, is different from that at *York*; or elſe the Converſion at *London* would be into the Body, as at *York*. But if not, what is the ſubſtantial Term of this ſubſtantial Change, where nothing but an accidental Mode doth follow? If there be any ſuch Term, whether that muſt not be a Production of ſomething which was not before; and if it be ſo, Chriſt muſt have as many new Bodies, as there are Conſecrations.

8. This makes that which hath no particular Subſiſtence of its own, to be the Subject of a ſubſtantial Change; for this is the condition of Chriſt's Body, whatever its manner of Exiſtence be, after the Hypoſtatical Union to the Divine Nature. For, when *Bellarmin*, *Petavius*, and others of their greateſt Divines, undertake, againſt *Neſtorius*, to explain the Hypoſtatical Union, they tell us it conſiſts in this, that the Human Nature loſeth it proper Subſiſtence, and is aſſumed into the Subſiſtence of the Divine Nature. Bellarm. *de Incarn. l.* 3. *c.* 8. Petav. *de Incarnatione. p.* 6. *c.* 1. §. 3.

From

From whence I infer, That the Body of Christ, having no proper Subsistence of its own, there can be no substantial Change into that which hath no proper Subsistence, but into that which hath; and consequently the Change must be into the Divine Nature principally; from whence it will follow, the Elements losing their Subsistence upon Consecration, the Divinity must be united hypostatically to them, as to the Human Nature; and so there will be as many Hypostatical Unions, as there are Consecrations. And so this Doctrine not only confounds Sense and Reason, but the Mysteries of Christ's Incarnation too: Which I think is sufficient for this Head.

VI. *Of Merits and Good Works.*

FOR the true stating this Controversy, we are to observe;

1. That we do not charge those of the Church of *Rome*, *That they believe Christ's Death and Passion to be ineffectual and insignificant, and that they have no dependence on the Merits of his Sufferings, or the Mercy of God for attaining Salvation; but that they are to be saved only by their own Merits and Good Works*; as the Misrepresenter saith, *Pag.* 12.

2. We do not charge them with denying the *necessity of Divine Grace in order to Merit*; *or with asserting that they can merit independently thereupon.*

3. We do by no means dispute about the *Necessity of Good Works*, in order to the Reward of another Life; or assert that Christ's Merits will save Men, without *working out their own Salvation*; but do firmly believe, that *God will judge Men according to their Works.*

The Question then is, *Whether the Good Works of a Just Man*, as our Author expresses it, *are truly meritorious of Eternal Life?* Which he affirms, but qualifies with saying, *That they proceed from Grace, and that through God's Goodness and Promise, they are truly meritorious.* But the Council of *Trent denounces an Anathema against those who deny the Good Works of Justified Persons, to be truly meritorious of the increase of Grace, and of Eternal Life.*

Pag. 13.

Concil. Trident. Sess. 6. Can. 32.

Here

Here then lie the Points in difference; (1.) Whether ſuch Good Works can be ſaid to be *truly meritorious?* (2.) Whether thoſe who deny it, deſerve an *Anathema* for ſo doing? As to what relates to *God's Acceptance and Allowance, and his Goodneſs and Promiſe*, we freely own all that he ſaith about it; and if no more be meant, what need an *Anathema* about this Matter? There muſt therefore be ſomething beyond this, when Good Works are not only ſaid to be *truly meritorious*, but we are curſed if we do not ſay the ſame.

To make any thing *truly meritorious*, we muſt ſuppoſe theſe Conditions requiſite.

1. That what we pretend to merit by, be our own free Act.
2. That it be not defective.
3. That there be an Equality between it, and the Reward due to it.
4. That there be an Obligation in Point of Juſtice, to give that Reward to him that doth it.

And from theſe Conſiderations, we deny that Good Works, even of Juſtified Perſons, can be *truly meritorious.*

1. It is granted by themſelves, That what is *truly meritorious*, muſt be a free Act of the Perſon who doth it. Now the Good Works of juſtified Perſons cannot be ſaid to be their own free Acts, if the Power of doing them depend upon Divine Aſſiſtance, and there was an antecedent Obligation upon them to perform them: So that they can do nothing but what they are bound to, as God's Creatures; and their very Power of doing it is from the Grace of God. If Men pretended to merit at another's hands by what God gives, there were ſome colour for it; but to merit from God himſelf by what he gives us, ſeems very incongruous. If I owe a Man an 100 *l.* and another knowing me unable to pay it, gives me ſo much to pay the Debt, this is no more than what may be called ſtrict Payment, as to the Creditor; but if the Creditor himſelf gives me this 100 *l.* to pay himſelf with, will any Man call this ſtrict Payment? He may call it ſo himſelf, if he pleaſes, but that only ſhews his Kindneſs

Meritum eſt Actio libera cui Merces debetur ex juſtitiâ. Conſter. *Enchirid. de Meritis bon. Oper. c.* 7.

In quantum homo propriâ voluntate facit id quod debet, meretur apud Deum, alioquin reddere debitum non eſſet meritorum. Aquin. 1, 2. *qu.* 114. *ar.* 1. *reſp. ad* 1.

neſs and Favour; but it doth not look very modeſtly or gratefully, for the Debtor to inſiſt upon it as *true legal Payment*. Juſt ſo it is in Good Works done by the Power of God's Grace, which we could never have done without it; and therefore ſuch cannot be *truly meritorious*.

2. What is *truly meritorious* muſt not be defective; becauſe the Proportion is to be equal between the Act, and the Reward due to it; which being perfect, requires that there be no Defect in the Acts which merit it. But this can never be ſaid of Good Works of juſtified Perſons, that they have no Defects in them. We do not ſay, they are not Good Works, but they are not exact and perfect: for altho the Grace of God, as it comes from him, be a perfect Gift; yet as it Acts upon Mens Minds, it doth not raiſe them to ſuch a degree, but that they have Imperfections in their beſt Actions. And whatever is defective, is faulty; whatever is faulty, muſt be forgiven; whatever needs forgiveneſs, cannot be *truly meritorious*. But not only their Good Works are defective; but if they would merit, they ought to have none but Good Works, whereas the mixture of others renders the good uncapable of being *meritorious*, becauſe there is ſo much to be pardoned, as takes away all claim of *Merit* in the good they perform. And themſelves do not pretend, that Men can merit the Grace of Remiſſion; but it is very ſtrange that thoſe who cannot deſerve to be forgiven, ſhould deſerve to have an infinite Reward beſtowed upon them.

Meritum ſe habet ad præmium ſicut pretium ad illum quod emitur. Altiſiodor. l. 3. tr. 12.

Abſoluta æqualitas inter mercedem & meritum ponitur per modum Juſtitiæ commutativæ. Bell. *Juſtif. l. 5. c. 14.*

3. There muſt be an exact Proportion between the Act and the Recompence: for to merit, is to pay a Price for a thing; and in ſuch Acts of commutative Juſtice, there muſt be an Equality of one thing with another. But what Equality can there be between the imperfect Good Works of the beſt Men, and the moſt perfect Happineſs of another World, eſpecially when that conſiſts in the fruition of the Beatifical Viſion? For what Proportion can there be between our Acts towards God, and God's Acts towards the Bleſſed in Heaven? Let the Acts be of what Perſon ſoever, or of what Nature ſoever, or from what Principle ſoever, as long as they are the Acts of finite imperfect Creatures, it is impoſſible there ſhould be any Equality, or exact Proportion

portion between them and the Eternal Favour of God, which is the Reward promiſed.

4. Where Acts are *truly meritorious*, there follows an Obligation of ſtrict Juſtice, to pay the Recompence due to them. But what ſtrict Juſtice can there be between the Creator and his Creatures, to recompence the Service they are bound to perform; when their very Being, Power to act, Aſſiſtance in acting, and Recompence for it, are all from his Bounty and Goodneſs? But our Author would avoid all this, by ſaying, that though Good Works are *truly meritorious*; yet it is *through the Merits of Chriſt, and as they proceed from Grace, and through his Goodneſs and Promiſe that they are ſo*; *i. e.* they are truly meritorious, becauſe it appears from all theſe things they neither are, nor can be meritorious. For,

(1.) How come the Merits of Chriſt to make Good Works *truly meritorious*? Are the Merits of Chriſt imputed to thoſe Good Works? Then thoſe Good Works muſt be as meritorious as Chriſt's own Works; which I ſuppoſe he will not aſſert. Or, is it that Chriſt hath merited the Grace whereby we may merit? But even this will not make our perſonal Acts truly meritorious; and the nature of Merit relates to the Acts, and not to the Power.

(2.) How comes the Power of Grace to make them *truly meritorious*; when the Power of Grace doth ſo much increaſe the Obligation on our ſide? If it be ſaid, *That the ſtate of Grace puts Men into a Capacity to merit*: we might more reaſonably infer the contrary, that it puts them out of a Capacity of meriting; becauſe the Remiſſion of Sins, and the Favour of God, are things for which we can never make him any Recompence.

(3.) How comes a Divine Promiſe to make Acts truly meritorious? For God's Promiſe is an Act of meer Kindneſs, which is very different from ſtrict Juſtice: and although by the Promiſe God binds himſelf to performance; yet how come thoſe Acts to be more meritorious of Heaven, than the Acts of Repentance are of Remiſſion of Sins? Yet none will now ſay, that there can be any Acts meritorious of that. Yet certainly there is as clear a promiſe of Pardon upon Repentance, as there is of Heaven upon Good Works: And

if the Promiſe in the other caſe doth not make Repentance meritorious of Pardon; how can it make Good Works truly meritorious of Eternal Life? But notwithſtanding, we do not deny God's Fidelity to his Promiſe may be called *Juſtice*, and ſo God, as a *Righteous Judg*, may give a *Crown of Righteouſneſs to all that follow St. Paul's Example*, without making Good Works to be *truly meritorious*.

2 Tim. 4. 8.

VII. *Of Confeſſion.*

WE do not charge the Church of *Rome*, that in the *Power of Abſolving, they make Gods of Men*, P. 14. as our *Miſrepreſenter* pretends.

2. We do not deny, *That Chriſt gave to the Biſhops and Prieſts of the Catholick Church, Authority to abſolve any truly penitent Sinner from his Sins*, (which he therefore needleſſy proves out of Scripture) *and that ſuch Abſolution is ratified in Heaven*.

3. We are glad to find that our Author declares, *That no Man receives benefit by Abſolution, without repentance from the bottom of his Heart, and real Intention of forſaking his Sins*; P. 15. by which we hope he means more than Attrition.

But yet there are ſome things which ſtick with us, as to the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome* in this Matter, which he takes no notice of.

1. That ſecret Confeſſion of Sins to a Prieſt, is made ſo neceſſary to Salvation, that an *Anathema* is denounced againſt all that deny it, when they cannot deny that God doth forgive Sins upon true Contrition. For the Council of *Trent* doth ſay, *That Contrition, with Charity, doth reconcile a Man to God before the Sacrament of Penance be actually received.* But then it adds, *That the deſire of Confeſſion is included in Contrition*: Which is impoſſible to be proved by Scripture, Reaſon, or Antiquity. For ſo lately, as in the time of the *Maſter of the Sentences*, and *Gratian* (in the 12*th* Century) it was a very diſputable Point, whether Confeſſion to a Prieſt were neceſſary. And it is very hard for us to underſtand how that ſhould become neceſſary to Salvation ſince, which was not then. Some of their own Writers confeſs, that ſome good Catholicks

Seſſ. 14. *Can.* 6.

Seſſ. 14. *c.* 4.

Lomb. *l.* 4. *Diſt.* 17. Grat. *de Pœnit. Diſt.* 1. *c.* 90. *Quidam.*

licks did not believe the neceſſity of it. I ſuppoſe the old Canoniſts may paſs for good Catholicks; and yet *Maldonat* ſaith, *That all the Interpreters of the Decrees held, that there was no Divine Precept for Confeſſion to a Prieſt*; and of the ſame Opinion he grants *Scotus* to have been. But he thinks *it is now declared to be Hereſy, or he wiſhes it were.* And we think it is too much already, unleſs there were better ground for it. Greg. de Valentiâ *de Neceſſit. Confeſſ. c.* 2. *Maldonat. Oper. To.* 2. *de Pœnit. c.* 2, & 3.

2. That an *Anathema* is denounced againſt thoſe who do not underſtand the words of Chriſt, *Whoſe Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c.* of the Sacrament of Penance, ſo as to imply the neceſſity of Confeſſion: Whereas there is no appearance in the words of any ſuch Senſe; and themſelves grant, that in order to the Remiſſion of Sins, by Baptiſm, (of which St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* ſpeak in the *Apoſtles Commiſſion*) there is no neceſſity of *Sacramental Confeſſion*, but a general Confeſſion is ſufficient. And from hence the Elder *Janſenius* concludes, *That the Power of Remiſſion of Sins here granted, doth not imply* Sacramental Confeſſion. *Cajetan* yields, *There is no Command for Confeſſion here.* And *Catharinus* adds, *That* Cajetan *would not allow any one Place of Scripture to prove Auricular Confeſſion.* And as to this Particular, he denies that there is any Command for it; and he goes not about to prove it, but that *Cajetan* contradicts himſelf elſewhere, *viz.* when he wrote School-Divinity, before he ſet himſelf to the ſtudy of the Scriptures. *Vaſquez* ſaith, *That if theſe words may be underſtood of Baptiſm, none can infer from them the Neceſſity of Auricular Confeſſion.* But *Gregory de Valentia* evidently proves, that this place doth relate to Remiſſion of Sins in Baptiſm; not only from the Compariſon of Places, but from the Teſtimonies of S. *Cyprian*, S. *Ambroſe*, and others. John 20. 23. S. Mat. 28. 19. Mark 16. 16. *Janſen. Concord Evang. c.* 143. *Cajetan. in hoc. Ed. Pariſ.* 1540. *Catharin. in Cajetan. l.* 5. *p.* 444. Vaſquez. *in* 3 *Part. Th. Tom.* 4. *Qu.* 90. *Art.* 1. *Dub.* 2. *Num.* 2. Greg. de Valent. *in Thom. Tom.* 4. *Diſp.* 7. *Qu.* 9. *Punct.* 2. *p.* 284.

3. That it is expreſſed in the ſame *Anathema*'s that this hath been always the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church from the beginning. We do not deny the ancient practice, either of *Canonical Confeſſion*, as part of the Diſcipline of the Church for publick Offences; nor of *Voluntary Confeſſion*, for eaſe and ſatisfaction of the perplexed Minds of doubting or dejected Penitents; but that which we ſay was not owned nor practiſed by the Church from the Beginning, was this Sacramental Confeſſion as neceſſary to the Remiſſion of Sins before God. It is therefore to no purpoſe

poſe to produce out of *Bellarmine*, and others, a great number of Citations, to prove that which we never deny; but if they hold to the Council of *Trent*, they muſt prove from the Fathers, that Sins after Baptiſm cannot be forgiven without Confeſſion to Men: which thoſe who conſider what they do, will never undertake, there being ſo many Teſtimonies of undoubted Antiquity againſt it. And it is obſervable, that *Bonaventure* grants, that before the *Lateran* Decree of *Innocentius* 3. it was no Hereſy to deny the Neceſſity of Confeſſion; and ſo he excuſes thoſe who in the time of *Lombard* and *Gratian*, held that Opinion. And all other Chriſtians in the World beſides thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, do to this day reject the Neceſſity of Particular Confeſſion to a Prieſt, in order to Remiſſion, as the Writers of the Church of *Rome* themſelves confeſs. So *Godignus* doth of the *Abyſſins*; *Philippus à SS. Trinitate*, of the *Jacobites*; *Clemens Galanus* of the *Neſtorians*, who ſaith, *They made a Decree againſt the uſe of Confeſſion to any but to God alone.* And *Alexius Meneſes* of the Chriſtians of S. *Thomas* in the *Indies*. The Greeks believe Confeſſion only to be of Poſitive and Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution, as the late Author of the *Critical Hiſtory of the Faith and Cuſtoms of the Eaſtern Nations*, proves. And the very Form of their Abſolution declares, that they do not think particular Confeſſion of all known Sins, neceſſary to Pardon: for therein the Prieſt abſolves the Penitent from *the Sins he hath not confeſſed through forgetfulneſs, or ſhame.* And now let any one prove this to have been a Catholick Tradition by *Vincentius* his Rules, *viz. That it hath been always received, every where, and by All.*

Bonavent. *in l.* 4. *Sent. Diſt.* 17. *part* 2.

Godign. *de rebus Abyſſin. l.* 1. *c.* 28.

Itinerarium Orientale. l. 5. *c.* 8.

Galan. Concil. Eccleſ. Armenæ. Tom. 2. *p.* 605.

Hiſtorie Critiq; de la Creance & de Coutums des Nations du Levant. c. 8. *p.* 105. *Ch.* 1. *pap.* 14.

Reſp. 1. *Jerem. Patriarch. ad Theolog. Wirtemberg. p.* 87.

Arcud. de Concord. Eccleſiæ Occident. & Orient. in 7. *Sacram. l.* 4. *c.* 3.

Goar *in Eucholog. p.* 681.

VIII. *Of Indulgences.*

1. THey muſt be extreamly ignorant, who take the Power of Indulgences, to be *a Leave from the Pope to commit what Sins they pleaſe; and that by virtue thereof, they ſhall eſcape Puniſhment for their Sins, without Repentance, in another World.* Yet this is the ſenſe of the Miſrepreſentation, which, he Pag. 15, 16. ſaith, is made of it. And if he ſaith true in his Preface, *That he hath deſcribed the Belief of a Papiſt, exactly according to the*

appre-

apprehenſion he had when he was a Proteſtant: He ſhews how well he underſtood the Matters in difference, when I think no other Perſon beſides himſelf ever had ſuch an apprehenſion of it, who pretended to be any thing like a Scholar.

2. *But now he believes it damnable to hold that the Pope, or any other Power in Heaven or Earth, can give him leave to commit any Sins whatſoever; or that for any Sum of Mony, he can obtain any Indulgence, or Pardon for Sins that are to be committed by him, or his Heirs hereafter.* Very well! But what thinks he of obtaining an Indulgence, or Pardon, after they are committed? Is no ſuch thing to be obtained in the Court of *Rome* for a Sum of Mony? He cannot but have heard of the *Tax* of the *Apoſtolick Chamber for ſeveral Sins*, and what Sums are there ſet upon them. Why did he not as freely ſpeak againſt this? This is publiſhed in the vaſt *Collection* of *Tracts* of *Canon Law*, ſet forth by the *Pope's Authority*, where there are certain Rates for Perjury, Murder, Apoſtacy, *&c.* Now what do theſe *Sums* of Mony mean? If they be ſmall, it is ſo much the better Bargain, for the Sins are very great. And *Eſpencæus* complains, *that this Book was ſo far from being called in, that*, he ſaith, *the Pope's Legats renewed thoſe Faculties, and confirmed them.* It ſeems then a Sum of Mony may be of ſome conſequence towards the obtaining Pardon for a Sin paſt, tho not for a Licence to commit it. But what mighty difference is there, whether a Man procures with Mony a *Diſpenſation*, or a *Pardon?* For the Sin can hurt him no more, than if he had Licence to commit it.

Tractat. Tractatuum. To. 15. *Part.* 1. *f.* 368.

Eſpancæ. *in Ep. ad Tit. c.* 1. *digreſſ.* 2.

3. *He doth believe there is a Power in the Church to grant Indulgences; which*, he ſaith, *concern not at all the Remiſſion of Sins, either Mortal or Venial, but only of ſome Temporal Puniſhments remaining due after the Guilt is remitted.* Here now ariſes a Material Queſtion, *viz.* Whether the *Popes*, or the *Repreſenter*, be rather to be believed. If the Popes, who grant the Indulgences are to be believed; then not only the bare Remiſſion of Sins is concerned in them, but *the Plenary*, and *moſt Plenary Remiſſion of Sins* is to be had by them. So *Boniface* the 8*th*, in his Bull of *Jubilee* granted, *Non ſolum plenam & largiorem, imo pleniſſimam veniam peccatorum.* If theſe words had no relation to remiſſion of Sins, the People were horribly cheated by the ſound of them. In the Bull of *Clement* the 6*th*, not

Bullar. Cherubin. in To. 1. *p.* 204.

not extant in the *Bullarium*, but publiſhed out of the *Utrecht* Manuſcript, not only a Plenary Abſolution from all Sins is declared to all Perſons who died in the Way to *Rome*; but he commands the Angels of Paradiſe to carry the Soul immediatly to Heaven. And I ſuppoſe, whatever implies ſuch an Abſolution as carries a Soul to Heaven, doth concern Remiſſion of Sins. *Boniface* IX, granted Indulgences, *à Pœnâ & à Culpâ*; and thoſe certainly concerned Remiſſion of Sins; being not barely from the Temporal Puniſhment, but from the Guilt it ſelf. *Clement* the 8*th*, whom *Bellarmine* magnifies for his care in reforming Indulgences, in his Bull of *Jubilee*, grants *a moſt Plenary Remiſſion of Sins*; and *Urban* the 8*th*, ſince him, not only a Relaxation of Penances, but *Remiſſion of Sins*; and ſo lately as *A. D.* 1671. *Clement* the 10*th* publiſhed an Indulgence upon the Canonization of five new Saints, wherein he not only grants a Plenary Indulgence of Sins, but upon invocation of one of theſe Saints *in the Point of Death*, *a Plenary Indulgence of all his Sins*. And what doth this ſignify *in the Point of Death*, if it do not concern the Remiſſion of Sins?

Prorſus mandamus Angelis Paradiſi, quantam animam illius à Purgatorio penitus abſolutam in Paradiſi gloriam introducant. *Bulla* Clem. 6. *ultrajecti A. D.* 1653. *Gobel. Perſon. Coſmoder. æt.* 6. *c.* 86. *p.* 278. Bullar. *To.* 3. *p.* 74. *To.* 4. *p.* 86.

4. *Indulgences*, he ſaith, *are nothing elſe but a Mitigation or Relaxation, upon juſt Cauſes, of Canonical Penances, which are or may be enjoyned by the Paſtors of the Church on penitent Sinners, according to their ſeveral degrees of Demerits.* If by Canonical Penances, they mean thoſe enjoined by the Penitential Canons, *Greg. de Valentia* ſaith, *This Opinion differs not from that of the Hereticks, and makes Indulgences to be uſeleſs and dangerous things.* *Bellarmine* brings ſeveral Arguments againſt this Doctrine. (1.) *There would be no need of the Treaſure of the Church; which he had proved to be the Foundation of Indulgences.* (2.) *They would be rather hurtful than profitable, and the Church would deceive her Children by them.* (3.) *They could not be granted for the Dead.* (4.) *They who receive Indulgences, do undergo Canonical Penances.* (5.) *The Form of them doth expreſs, that they do relate to God, and not only to the Church.* And this, I think, is ſufficient to ſhew how far he is from true Repreſenting the Nature of Indulgences; for we do not diſpute the Church's Power in relaxing Canonical Penances to Penitent Sinners upon juſt Cauſes.

Greg. de Valent. *de Indulg. c.* 2. Bell. *de Indulg. l.* 1. *c.* 7. *C.* 2.

IX. *Of Satisfaction.*

1. HE *believes it damnable to think any thing injuriously of Christ's Passion:* But then he distinguishes *the Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin. As to the Guilt and Eternal Pain, the Satisfaction,* he saith, *is proper to Christ; but as to the Temporal Pain, which may remain due by God's Justice, after the other are remitted,* he saith, *that Penitent Sinners may in some measure satisfy for that by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c.* p. 17.

2. *These Penitential Works,* he saith, *are no otherwise satisfactory, than as joined and applied to Christ's Satisfaction, in virtue of which alone our good Works find a grateful acceptance in God's sight.* P. 19.

But for right apprehending the State of the Controversy, we must consider;

1. That they grant both Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin, to be remitted in Baptism; so that all the Satisfaction to be made, is for Sins committed after Baptism.

2. We distinguish between Satisfaction to the Church before Absolution, and Satisfaction to the Justice of God for some part of the punishment to Sin which is unremitted.

3. We do not deny that truly Penitential Works are pleasing to God, so as to avert his Displeasure; but we deny that there can be *any Compensation in way of equivalency,* between what we suffer, and what we deserve. *Catech. Roman. Part 2. c. 5. n. 52, 56.*

The Matter in Controversy therefore on this Head, consists in these things.

1. That after the total Remission of Sins in Baptism, they suppose a Temporal Punishment to remain, when the Eternal is forgiven; which the Penitent is to satisfy God's Justice for; and without this being done in this Life, he must go into Purgatory for that End. Of which more under that Head.

2. That this Satisfaction may be made to the Justice of God, after Absolution is given by the Priest. So that altho the Penitent be admitted into God's Favour, by the Power of the Keys, according to their own Doctrine; yet the Application of the Merits of Christ, together with the Saints

in

in the Sentence of Absolution (according to their Form) do not set him so free, but he either wants a new supply from the Treasure of the Church, *i. e.* from the same Merits of Christ and the Saints; or else he is to satisfy for the Temporal Punishment by his own Penances.

3. That these Penitential Works are to be joined with the Merits of Christ, in the way of proper Satisfaction to Divine Justice. And however softly this may be expressed; the meaning is, that Christ hath merited, that we may merit, and by his Satisfaction, we are enabled to satisfy for our selves. And if the Satisfaction by way of Justice be taken away, the other will be a Controversy about Words.

Catech. Rom. de Pœnit. Sacr. n. 61.

4. That these Penitential Works may not only be sufficient for themselves, but they may be so over-done, that a great share may be taken from them to make up the Treasure of the Church, for the benefit of others who fall short, when they are duly applied to them in the way of Indulgences. And about these Points, we must desire greater Proof than we have ever yet seen.

X. *Of reading the Holy Scripture.*

Pag. 19.

1. HE *believes it damnable in any one, to think, speak, or do any thing irreverently towards the Scripture, or by any means whatsoever to bring it into disrepute or disgrace:* but not being contented with this, he adds, *That he holds it in the highest Veneration of all Men living.* Now, here we must desire a little better Representation of this Matter. For certainly, those who derive its Authority from the Church; who set Traditions in equal esteem with it; who complain so much of its Obscurity, can never be said to hold it in equal Veneration with those who maintain its independent Authority, its Sufficiency, and Perspicuity. And these are known and material Points in Controversy between us and them: therefore let them not say, they hold it in the highest Veneration of all Men living; tho those thought themselves through Catholicks, who have compared it to a *Nose of Wax*, *to a* Lesbian *Rule*, *to a dead Letter*, *unsensed Characters*, and to other things, not fit to be repeated. But we are well pleased to find

find them expreſs ſuch Veneration for it. Wherefore then are the People to be kept from reading it?

2. He ſaith, *It is not out of diſreſpect to it.* But why then? (1.) *Becauſe private Interpretation is not proper for the Scripture*, 2 Pet. 1. 20. One would think the Scripture were not kept *only* from the People, by ſuch a ſenſe being put upon it; for any one that would but conſider that place, will find it muſt relate to the Prophets themſelves; and doth he think the Prophets were to be debarr'd from reading the Scriptures? But this is playing with Scripture, and not reaſoning from it. (2.) *Becauſe in the Epiſtles of S.* Paul *are certain things hard to be underſtood, which the unlearned and unſtable deprave, as alſo the reſt of the Scriptures, to their own perdition*, 2 Pet. 3. 16. Now in my Opinion, ſuch Men deſerve more to be debarr'd from medling with the Scripture, who make ſuch perverſe Inferences from it, than ordinary Readers. And if they uſe all other places as they do this, they cannot be excuſed from *depraving* it. It is granted, there were then *unlearned and unſtable Men*, who miſunderſtood, or miſapplied the Writings of St. *Paul*, and other Scriptures. And what then? There are Men of all Ages, who abuſe the beſt things in the World, even the Goſpel it ſelf, and the Grace of God. Doth it hence follow, that the Goſpel muſt not be preached to them, or the Grace of God made known to them, for fear of Mens making ill uſe of it? If this had been the juſt Conſequence, would not St. *Peter* himſelf have thought of this? But he was ſo far from making it, that he adviſeth thoſe Perſons he writes to, to have a mighty regard to the Scriptures, even to the Prophetical Writings, *as to a Light ſhining in a dark place*, 1 Pet. 1. 19. According to this way of deducing Conſequences, S. *Peter* ſhould have argued juſt contrary; *The Prophetical Writings are dark and obſcure, therefore meddle not with them, but truſt your Guides:* Whereas the Apoſtle, after he had told them what the Apoſtles ſaw and heard, he adds, *That they have a more ſure Prophetical Word*, as the Rhemiſts tranſlate it. How could that be *more ſure* to them, unleſs they were allowed to read, conſider, and make uſe of it? (3.) *Becauſe God hath given only ſome to be Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, other ſome Evangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors*, Eph. 4. 11. Doth it hence follow that the People are not to read the Scriptures? In the,

Universities, Tutors are appointed to interpret *Aristotle* to their Pupils; doth it hence follow that they are not to read *Aristotle* themselves; It is, no doubt, a mighty Advantage to have such Infallible Interpreters as the *Apostles* and *Prophets*; and all Christians are bound to follow their Sense, where they have delivered it. But suppose the Question be about the Sense of these Interpreters; must their Books not be looked into, because of the danger of Error? This Reason will still hold against those who go about to deliver their Sense; and so on, till by this Method of Reasoning, all sorts of Books and Interpretations be rejected; unless any such can be found out, which is not liable to be abused or misunderstood. And if there be any such to be had, they are much to blame who do not discover it. But as yet we see no Remedy for two things in Mankind, a proneness to Sin, and to Mistake. But of all things, we ought not to take away from them one of the best Means to prevent both, *viz.* a diligent, and careful, and humble reading the Holy Scriptures.

Pag. 21. But, 3. He denies *that all Persons are forbid to read the Scriptures, but only such as have no License, and good Testimony from their Curats: and therefore their design is not to preserve Ignorance in the People, but to prevent a blind ignorant presumption.*

These are plausible Pretences to such as search no further; but the Mistery of this Matter lies much deeper. It was, no doubt, the Design of the Church of *Rome* to keep the Bible wholly out of the hands of the People. But upon the Reformation they found it impossible; so many Translations being made into vulgar Languages; and therefore care was taken to have Translations made by some of their own Body; and since the People of better inclinations to Piety were not to be satisfied without the Bible; therefore they thought it the better way to permit certain Persons whom they could trust, to have a License to read it: And this was the true Reason of the Fourth Rule of the *Index Liber prohibit*, made in pursuance of the Order of the Council of *Trent*, and published by *Pius* IV. by which any one may see it was not an Original Permission out of any good Will to the Thing; but an aftergame to get the Bible out of the Hands of the people again: And therefore Absolution was to be denied to those who would not deliver them to their Ordinaries when they were called for:

for: And the Regulars themſelves were not to be permitted to have Bibles without a Licenſe: And as far as I can underſtand the Addition of *Clement* VIII, to that Fourth Rule, he withdraws any new Power of granting ſuch Licenſes; and ſaith they are contrary to the *Command and Uſage of that Church, which*, he ſaith, *is to be inviolably obſerved:* wherein I think he declares himſelf fully againſt ſuch Licenſes: And that Inferior Guides ſhould grant them againſt the Command of the Head of the Church, is a thing not very agreeable to the Unity and Subordination they boaſt of.

Quod quidem inviolatè ſervandum eſt. Clem. VIII. *ad Reg. 4. Indicit Romæ.*

XI. *Of Apocryphal Books.*

WE do not charge the Church of *Rome* with *making what Additions to Scripture they think good*, as the *Miſrepreſenter* ſaith; but we charge them with taking into the Canon of Scripture ſuch Books as were not received for Canonical by the Chriſtian Church; as thoſe Books himſelf mentions, *viz. Toby, Judith, Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdom*, and *Maccabees*. Pag. 21.

2. We do not only charge them with this, but with Anathematizing all thoſe who do not upon this Declaration believe them to be Canonical; ſince they cannot but know, that theſe Books never were in the *Jewiſh* Canon, and were left out by many Chriſtian Writers. And if the Church cannot add to the Scripture, and our Author *thinks it damnable to do it*; how can it make any Books *Canonical*, which were not ſo received by the Church? For the *Scripture* in this ſenſe is the *Canon*; and therefore if it add to the *Canon*, it adds to the Scripture; *i. e.* it makes it neceſſary to believe ſome Books to be of infallible Authority, which were not believed to be ſo, either by the *Jewiſh* or Chriſtian Church, as appears by abundant Teſtimonies to that purpoſe produced by a Learned Biſhop of this Church; which ought to have been conſidered by the *Repreſenter*, that he might not have talked ſo crudely about this Matter. *Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 4. 8. Apr. de Canon. Script.* Bp *Coſins* Scholaſtical Hiſtory of the Canon of Scripture.

But however, I muſt conſider what he ſaith;

1. He produces the Teſtimonies of *Greg. Nazianzen*, who is expreſly againſt him, and declares but Twenty two Books in the Canon of the Old Teſtament; but how doth he Greg. Nazianzen *in Carmin.* 2 *vol. p.* 98.

prove that he thought these Books Canonical? He quotes his *Oration on the Maccabees*; where I can find nothing like it; and instead of it he expresly follows, as he declares, the Book of *Josephus*, of *the Authority of Reason* concerning them. So that if this proves any thing, it proves *Josephus* his Book Canonical, and not the *Maccabees*.

Orat. de Macab. vol. 1. p. 358.

2. He adds the Testimony of St. *Ambrose*, who in the place he refers to, enlarges on the Story of the *Maccabees*, but saith nothing of the Authority of the Book. And even *Coccius* himself grants, that of old *Melito Sardensis*, *Amphilochius*, *Greg. Nazianzen*, the Council of *Laodicea*, St. *Hierom*, *Ruffinus*, and *Gregory* the Great, did not own the Book of *Maccabees* for Canonical.

Ambros. de Jacob. & Vita Erat. l. 2. c. 10, 11, 12.
Cocci Thes. Cathol. l. 6. Act. 1.

3. *Innocentius ad Exuperium* speaks more to his purpose. And if that Decretal Epistle be allowed, against which Bishop *Cosins* hath made considerable Objections; then it must be granted, that these Books were then in the *Roman* Canon: but that they were not received by the Universal Church, appears evidently by the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, *c.* 60. wherein these Books are left out; and this was received in the Code of the Universal Church; which was as clear a Proof of the Canon then generally received, as can be expected. It is true, the Council of *Carthage* took them in; and St. *Augustine* seems to be of the same Opinion: But on the other side, they are left out by *Melito* Bishop of *Sardis*, who lived near the Apostles times, *Origen*, *Athanasius*, S. *Hilary*, St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, *Epiphanius*, St. *Basil*, *Amphilochius*, St. *Chrysostom*, and especially St. *Jerom*, who hath laboured in this point so much, that no fewer than thirteen places are produced out of him to this purpose, by the fore-mentioned Learned Bishop of our Church, who clearly proves there was no Tradition for the Canon of the Council of *Trent* in any one Age of the Christian Church. But our Author goes on.

Scholastical History, n. 83.

Euseb. l. 5. c. 24.
Orig. Pref. in Psal.
Athan. in Synopsi.
Hilar Pref in. Psal.
S. Cyril. Catech. 4.
Epiph. hær. 8. 76.
Basil. Philocal. c. 3.
Amphil. Epist. Canon. ad Seleuc.
Chrys. Hom. 4. in Gen.
Scholast. Hist. n. 71.

4. *It is of little concern to him, whether these Books were ever in the Hebrew Copy.* I would only ask whether it be of any concern to him, whether they were divinely inspired or not? He saith, *It is damnable to add to the Scripture*: by the Scripture we mean Books written by Divine Inspiration. Can the Church make Books to be so written, which were not so written? If not, then all it hath to do, is to deliver by Tradition what

P. 22.

was

was so, and what not. Whence should they have this Tradition, but from the *Jews?* and they owned no Divine Inspiration after the time of *Malachy*. How then should there be any Books so written after that time? And he that saith in this Matter, as he doth, *It is of little concern to him whether they were in the Hebrew Canon*, doth little concern himself what he ought to believe, and what not, in this matter.

5. *Since the Churches Declaration*, he saith, *no Catholicks ever doubted.* What doth he mean by the Churches Declaration, that of *Innocent*, and the Council of *Carthage?* Then the same Bishop hath shewed him, that since that time, there have been very many, both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, of another Opinion. And a little before the Council of *Trent*, *Catharinus* saith, *That a Friend of his, and a Brother in Christ, derided him as one that wanted Learning, for daring to assert these Books were within the Canon of Scripture*; and it is plain, *Cardinal Cajetan* could never be perswaded of it: But if he means since the Council of *Trent*, then we are returned to our Difficulty, how such a Council can make any Books Canonical, which were not received for such by the Catholick Church before? For then they do not declare the Canon, but create it.

P. 23.

Cathar. Advers. Cajet. p. 48. *ed.* Paris 1535.

XII. *Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.*

1. WE do not dispute about the *Vulgar Edition*, whether it may not be preferr'd before modern *Latin Editions*, because of its great *Antiquity* in some parts of it, and its general Reception since the time of *Greg.* I. But our dispute is, Whether it be made so authentick since the Council of *Trent*, that no Appeals are to be made to the Originals, *i. e.* Whether that Council by its Authority could make a Version equal to the Originals out of which it was made? Especially since at the time of that Decree, the *Vulgar Edition* was confessed to be full of Errors and Corruptions by *Sixtus* V. who saith he took infinite pains to correct them, and yet left very many behind, as appeared by *Clement* VIII, who corrected his *Bibles* in very many places, and grants some faults were left uncorrected still. Now, how

P. 24, 25.

In hac Vulgata Editione visa sunt nonnulla mutanda, quæ consulto mutata non sunt. Clem. VIII. *in Bullâ.*

was

was it possible for the Council of *Trent* to declare that Edition Authentick, which was afterwards so much corrected? And, whether was the correct Edition of *Sixtus* V. *Authentick* or not, being made in pursuance of the Decree of the Council? If not, how comes *Clement* his Edition to be made Authentick, when the other was not, since there may be Corruptions found in that, as well as the other; and no one can tell, but it may be reviewed and corrected still; as some of their own Writers confess *it stands in need of it?*

Luc. Brugens. *in variis Lect.*

Nat. Alexand. *dissert de vulg. vers. quæst. 6.*

2. Our Controversy is not so much about the Authority of the Vulgar *Latin*, above other *Latin* Versions to those who understand them; but whether none else but the Latin Version must be used by those who understand it not? And here our *Representer* saith, that *he is commanded not to read any of these Translations*, (speaking of *Tindals*, and that in Q. *Elizabeth*'s time) *but only that which is recommended to him by the Church.* If this relate to the *Vulgar Latin*, then we are to seek, why the Common People should have none to read, but what they cannot understand; if to *Translations of their own*, then we doubt not to make it appear, that our Translation allowed amongst us, is more exact and agreeable than any they can put into their hands.

P. 26.

XIII. *Of the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith.*

P. 27.

THE only thing insisted on here, is, *That it is not the words, but the sense of Scripture is the Rule; and that this sense is not to be taken from Mens private Fancies, which are various and uncertain; and therefore where there is no security from Errors, there is nothing capable of being a Rule.*

To clear this, we must consider,

1. That it is not necessary to the making of a Rule, to prevent any possibility of mistake, but that it be such that they cannot mistake without their own fault. For Certainty in it self, and Sufficiency for the use of others, are all the necessary Properties of a Rule; but after all, it's possible for Men not to apply the Rule aright, and then they are to be blamed, and not the Rule.

2. If no Men can be certain of the right Sense of Scripture,

ture, then it is not plain in neceſſary things; which is contrary to the deſign of it, and to the cleareſt Teſtimonies of Antiquity, and to the common ſenſe of all Chriſtians, who never doubted or diſputed the Senſe of ſome things revealed therein; as the Unity of the Godhead, the making of the World by him, the Deluge, the Hiſtory of the Patriarchs, the Captivity of the Jews, the coming of the Meſſias, his ſending his Apoſtles, his coming again to Judgment, *&c.* No Man who reads ſuch things in Scripture, can have any doubt about the ſenſe and meaning of the Words.

3. Where the Senſe is dubious, we do not allow any Man to put what Senſe he pleaſes upon them; but we ſay, there are certain means, whereby he may either attain to the true Senſe, or not be damned if he do not. And the firſt thing every Man is to regard, is not his ſecurity from being deceived, but from being damned. For Truth is made known in order to Salvation: If therefore I am ſure to attain the chief end, I am not ſo much concerned, as to the poſſibility of Errors, as that I be not deceived by my own fault. We do not therefore leave Men *either to follow their own fancy, or to interpret Scripture by it*; but we ſay, They are bound upon pain of Damnation to ſeek the Truth ſincerely, and to uſe the beſt means in order to it; and if they do this, they either will not err, or their Errours will not be their Crime.

XIV. *Of the Interpretation of Scripture.*

1. THE Queſtion is not, Whether Men are not bound to make uſe of the beſt means for the right Interpretation of Scripture, by Reading, Meditation, Prayer, Advice, a humble and teachable Temper, *&c. i. e.* all the proper means fit for ſuch an end? but whether after all theſe, there be a neceſſity of ſubmitting to ſome Infallible Judge in order to the attaining the certain Senſe of Scripture?

2. The Queſtion is not, Whether we ought not to have a mighty regard to the Senſe of the whole Chriſtian Church in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles, which we profeſs to have? but Whether the *preſent Roman Church*, as it ſtands divided from other Communions, hath ſuch a Right and Authority to interpret

pret Scripture, that we are bound to believe that to be the Infallible Senſe of Scripture which ſhe delivers?

And here I cannot but take notice how ſtrangely this matter is here miſrepreſented: for the Caſe is put,

P. 29. 1. *As if every one who rejects their pretence of Infallibility, had nothing to guide him but his own private Fancy in the Interpretation of Scripture.*

2. *As if we rejected the Senſe put upon Scripture by the whole Community of Chriſtians in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles times.* Whereas we appeal in the matters in difference between us, to this univerſal Senſe of the Chriſtian Church, and are verily perſwaded they cannot make it out in any one Point wherein we differ from them. And themſelves cannot deny, that in ſeveral we have plainly the conſent of the firſt Ages, as far as appears by the Books remaining, on our ſide; as in the Worſhip of Images, Invocation of Saints, Papal Supremacy, Communion in both kinds, Prayer and Scripture in known Tongues; and I may ſafely add, the Sufficiency of the Scripture, Tranſubſtantiation, Auricular Confeſſion, Publick Communions, Solitary Maſſes, to name no more.

But here lies the Artifice; We muſt not pretend to be capable of judging either of Scripture, or Tradition; but we muſt truſt their Judgment what is the ſenſe of Scripture, and what hath been the Practice of the Church in all Ages, altho their own Writers confeſs the contrary: which is very hard.

But he ſeems to argue for ſuch a ſubmiſſion to the Church;

P. 29. 1. *Becauſe we receive the Book of Scripture from her; therefore from her we are to receive the ſenſe of the Book.* An admirable Argument! We receive the *Old Teſtament* from the *Jews*; therefore from them we are to receive the ſenſe of the *Old Teſtament*, and ſo we are to reject the true *Meſſias*. But this is not all: If by the Church, they mean the Church of *Rome* in diſtinction from others, we deny it: if they mean the whole Chriſtian Church we grant it; but then the force of it is quite loſt. But why is it not poſſible for the Church of *Rome* to keep theſe Writings, and deliver them to others, which make againſt her ſelf? Do not Perſons in Law-Suits often produce Deeds which make againſt them? But there is yet a further Reaſon; it was not poſſible for the Church of *Rome* to make away theſe Writings, being ſo univerſally ſpread.

2. *Be-*

2. *Because the Church puts the difference between true and false Books, therefore that must be trusted for the true sense of them.* Which is just as if one should argue, The Clerks of the Rolls are to give an account to the Court of true Records, therefore they are to sit on the Bench, and to give Judgment in all Causes. The Church is only to declare what it finds as to Canonical Books; but hath no Power to make any Book Canonical which was not before received for such. But I confess *Stapleton* saith, the Church if it please may make *Hermes* his Pastor, and *Clemens* his Constitutions Canonical: but I do not think our Author will therein follow him. Controv. 5. Qu. 4. art. 2.

XV. *Of Tradition.*

1. THE Question is not about *Human Traditions supplying the Defects of Scripture*, as he misrepresents it; but whether there be an unwritten Word, which we are equally bound to receive with the Written Word: Altho these things which pass under that Name, are really but *Human Traditions*; yet we do not deny that they pretend them to be of Divine Original. P. 30, 31.

2. We do not deny, but the *Apostles might deliver such things by Word as well as by Epistle, which their Disciples were bound to believe and keep*: but we think there is some difference to be made between what we certainly know they delivered in Writing, and what it is now impossible for us to know; *viz.* what they delivered by word without writing. 2 Thes. 2. 13

3. We see no ground why any one should believe any Doctrine *with a stedfast and Divine Faith*, which is not bottom'd on the Written word; for then his Faith must be built on the Testimony of the Church as Divine and Infallible, or else his Faith cannot be Divine. But it is impossible to prove it to be Divine and Infallible, but by the Written Word; and therefore, as it is not reasonable that he should believe the Written Word by such a Divine Testimony of the Church; so if any particular Doctrine may be received on the Authority of the Church without the Written Word, then all Articles of Faith may, and so there would be no need of the Written Word. P. 31.

P. 32. 4. *The Faith of Christians doth no otherwise stand upon the Foundation of the Churches Tradition*, than as it delivers down to us the Books of Scripture; but we acknowledg the general Sense of the Christian Church to be a very great help for understanding the true sense of Scripture; and we do not reject any thing so delivered; but what is all this to the Church of *Rome?* But this is still the way of true Representing.

XVI. *Of Councils.*

P. 33. 1. WE are glad to find so good a Resolution as seems to be expressed in these words, viz. *That he is obliged to believe nothing besides that which Christ taughs, and his Apostles; and if any thing contrary to this should be defined, and commanded to be believed, even by Ten Thousand Councils, he believes it damnable in any one to receive it, and by such Decrees to make Additions to his Creed.* This seems to be a very good saying, and it is pity any thing else should overthrow it. But here lies the Misrepresenting; he will believe what Christ and his Apostles taught, from the Definitions of Councils, and so all this goodly Fabrick falls to nothing; for it is but as if one should say, If *Aristotle* should falsly deliver *Plato*'s sense, I will never believe him, but I am resolved to take *Plato*'s sense only from *Aristotle*'s words. So here, he first declares he will take the Faith of Christ from the Church; and then he saith, if the Church Representative should contradict the Faith of Christ, he would never believe it.

2. We dispute not with them, the Right and Necessity of *General Councils*, (upon great occasions) if they be truly so, rightfully called, lawfully assembled, and fairly managed; which have been, and may be of great use to the Christian world, for setling the Faith, healing the Breaches of Christendom, and reforming Abuses. And we farther say, that the Decrees of such Councils ought to be submitted to, where they proceed upon certain Grounds of Faith, and not upon unwritten Traditions; Which was the fatal stumbling at the Threshold in the Council of *Trent*, and was not to be recovered afterwards; for their setting up Traditions equally with the Written Word, made it easie for

for them to define, and as easit for all others to reject their Definitions, in case there had not been so many other Objections against the Proceedings of that Council. And so all our Dispute concerning this matter is taken off from the general Notion, and runs into the particular Debate concerning the Qualifications and Proceedings of some which were called Free, General Councils, but were neither *General*, nor *Free*; and therefore *could not deliver the sense of the Catholick Church*, which our Author requires them to do. P. 33.

XVII. *Of Infallibility in the Church.*

1. HE doth not pretend this belongs *to the Pastors and Prelates of his Church, who may fall*, he saith, *into Heresie and Schism*; *but that the whole Church is secured by Divine Promises from all Error and Danger of Prevarication*; which he proves from *the Promises of the New Testament*, *Mat.* 16. 18.——28. 20. *Joh.* 14. 16, 26. But however the former seems to take away Infallibility from the Guides of the Church, yet that this is to be understood of them *separately*, appears by what follows. P. 36.

2. *The like Assistance of the Holy Ghost he believes to be in all General Councils, which is the Church Representative; by which they are specially protected from all error in all definitions and declarations in matters of Faith.* P. 38.

Now here are two sorts of Infallibility tacked to one another by vertue of these general Promises, which ought more distinctly to be considered.

1. To preserve Christs Church so as it shall never cease to be a Church, is one thing; to preserve it from all Error is another: The former answers the End of Christs Promises as to the *Duration* of the *Church*; and the latter is not implied in them.

2. The promise of *teaching them all Truth*, Joh. 16. 13. is not made to the whole Church, but to the *Apostles*: And their case was so peculiar and extraordinary, that there can be no just inference from the assistance promised to them, of what the Church would enjoy in all Ages.

3. If the diffusive Church have no infallible Assistance promised, then no infallible Assistance can from thence be proved

for the Church Representative; so that some particular Promises to the Guides of the Church as assembled together, are necessary to prove the Infallibility of Councils.

P. 38. 4. It by no means proves following Councils to be Infallible, because the Apostles said, *Acts* 15. 28. *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.* Our Author *doth not doubt, but the same may be prefixed to all determinations in point of Faith, resolved on by any General Council lawfully assembled since that time, or to be held to the Worlds end.* But what Reason he had for not doubting in this matter, I cannot see; *the Assistance*, he saith, *being to extend as far as the Promise:* But shall *Assistance* imply *Infallibility?* Then there must be good store, as long as the Promises of Divine Grace hold good: But this Assistance of Councils is very different from the Assistance of Grace, for the Church may subsist without Councils, but cannot without Grace: What General Council was there from the meeting, *Acts* 15. to the Council of *Nice?* Were not Christs Promises fulfilled to his Church all that time, when it encreased in all parts against the most violent Opposition?

P. 39. 5. No Parity of Reason from the *Jewish* Church can be sufficient Proof for Infallibility in the Christian. But our Author argues thus, *If Gods special Assistance was never wanting to the Church of the Jews so as to let it fail in the truth of its Doctrine, or its Authority; Why should not he believe the same of the Church of Christ, which is built on better Promises?* What special Assistance was it which *Israel* had, when it is said, that *for a long time* Israel

2 Chron. 15. 3. *had been without the true God, and without a teaching Priest, and without Law?* And as to *Judah*, was there no failing in point of Doctrine in our Saviours time? It is true, they had the Law intire, and that was all that was good among them, for their Teachers had corrupted themselves and the People, and made the Law of no effect among them: If there were Infallibility any where, it must be in the high Priest and *Sanhedrim*; but is it possible for any Christian to think them Infallible when they were so grosly mistaken about the main Article of their Faith as to the Messias, and pronounced him worthy of death? Is not this a fine Argument for the Infallibility of the Guides of the Christian Church? *Because the Church of Christ hath better Promises:*

No

No doubt of it, greater Promiſes of Grace and Mercy in this World, and in that to come: but what is all this to Infallibility in Councils?

6. Chriſts command of Obedience to thoſe who ſat in *Moſes* Chair, (*Matt.* 23. 2.) doth not prove the Infallibility of thoſe who ſat there. Yet this is alledged to that purpoſe; and that men ought not to doubt of the reaſonableneſs of the Commands of their Superiors. But St *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, *our Saviour ſpeaks of the things commanded by the Law of* Moſes. *Per Cathedram Doctrinam Legis oſtendit*, ſaith St. *Jerom: Not their own Doctrine, but that of* Moſes, ſaith *Iſidore*; and ſo *Hilary* and *Theophylact*. *Maldonate* confeſſeth, our Saviours Words are to be underſtood, not of their own Doctrine, but of that of the Law; and therefore he yeilds the Obedience here required to be reſtrained to that; *All things*, ſaith *Cajetan*, *which they teach out of* Moſes's *Chair: Not all their Doctrines, but as far as they were conformable to the Laws*, ſaith *Ferus*. Now can any one hence infer, that no men ought to diſpute any Commands of Superiors, when it is ſuppoſed, that there is a Rule and Standard for them to ſpeak according to; and our Saviour elſewhere doth ſuppoſe theſe very Men to teach things contrary to the Law, as in the Caſe of *Corban*. Would our Saviour contradict himſelf? or require a blind Obedience in things repugnant to the Law? We do not deny a due ſubmiſſion to our Superiors in the Church; yea, we allow them a Power to determine things not forbidden; and think Obedience due in ſuch things by vertue of their Authority; but yet this is far enough from Infallibility, or an unlimited implicit Obedience, which would overthrow the force of all our Saviours Reaſonings againſt the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, as to their miſinterpretihg the Law, and the Superſtitious Practiſes they impoſed upon the People.

P. 39. *Chryſoſt.* in Mat. Hom. 72. *Hierom* in loc. *Caten. Gr.* in loc. *Hilar.* Canon. 24. *Theophilact* in loc. Matt. 15.

XVIII. *Of the* POPE.

1. WE do not charge them with *believing the Pope to be God*; which it ſeems himſelf did, if we believe the *Miſrepreſenter* in his Preface; but there is ſome reaſon to doubt whether

Cerem. Sect. 1. c. 2. ther they do not at ſome times give him greater Honour than becomes a Man. I inſtance in the Adoration after his Election, when the new Pope is placed upon the Altar to receive the Submiſſions of the Cardinals: but the Altar, themſelves do confeſs to be ſacred to God alone: And there they profeſs to Worſhip Jeſus Chriſt, as preſent in the Hoſt. This therefore looks too much like aſſuming the Place of Chriſt, and not becoming the Diſtance between God and Man.

Pag. 40. 2. The Queſtion is, *Whether Chriſt hath appointed the Pope or Biſhop of* Rome *to be Paſtor, Governour, and Head of his Church under him? This*, he ſaith, *he believes*, and this he knows we deny, and therefore had Reaſon to expect ſome Proof of it. But inſtead thereof he tells us *how they look on themſelves as obliged to ſhew him the Reſpect due to his Place*, which he knows is not the matter in Queſtion. Two things however he ſaith, which ſeem to juſtifie his Title.

Pag. 41. 1. *He is the Succeſſor of St.* Peter, *to whom Chriſt committed the care of his Flock.* But how far is this from proving the Pope to be Head of the Church under Chriſt? For how doth it appear that Chriſt ever made St. *Peter* Head of the Church, or committed his Flock to him, in contradiſtinction to the reſt of the Apoſtles? This is ſo far from being evident from Scripture, that the Learned Men of their Church are aſhamed of the Places commonly produced for it; it being impoſſible ever to juſtifie the ſenſe of them according to their own Rules of interpreting Scripture, *viz.* by the unanimous conſent of the Fathers. *For*, 1. *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, is interpreted by many of the Fathers both *Greek and Latin, of* St. *Peters* Confeſſion, and not of his Perſon; ſo by S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auguſtin*, S. *Baſil* of *Seluciæ*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Gregory Nyſſen*, and *Theodoret*; all great and conſiderable Perſons in the Chriſtian Church, whoſe Words are plain and full to that purpoſe; and ſo they can never produce the unanimous conſent of the Fathers for S. *Peter*'s Supremacy out of theſe words. 2. *And unto thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, are interpreted by the Fathers of S. *Peter* in common

Matt 16 18. *Chryſoſt.* hom. 1 in Pentec. Tom. 5 ed Savil p. 979. *Ambroſ.* de Incarnat. dom. Sacramento c. 5. *Aug.* de verbis Dom. ad Evang. ſecund Matth. Serm. 13. Tract. in Joh. 124. *Baſil. Seleuc.* Orat. 25 ad fin. *Hilar.* de Trinit. l. 6. *Greg. Nyſſen* de Advent Domini cap. ult. *Theodoret* Epiſt. 77. 146. Matt. 16. 19.

with

with the other Apoſtles; ſo *Origen*, S. *Cyprian*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Hierom*, and S. *Auguſtin*, as they are all owned by ſome Members of the *Roman* Communion. And 3. For theſe Words, *Feed my ſheep*, a late Learned Doctor of the *Sorbon* ſhews, that if they prove any thing peculiar to S. *Peter*, they muſt prove him ſole Paſtor of the Church, which was the thing S. *Gregory* diſputed againſt ſo warmly. But that there was nothing peculiar to S. *Peter*, above or beyond the reſt of the Apoſtles, he ſhews at large from S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Cyril*, S. *Auguſtin*, and others, to whom I refer the Reader, and to the former Authors. But ſuppoſe it were made to appear, *That S.* Peter *was Head of the Church*; How doth the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Succeſſion in that Headſhip ſhew it ſelf? To that he ſaith, 2. *That there hath been a viſible ſucceſſion of above Two hundred and fifty Biſhops, acknowledged as ſuch in all paſt Ages by the Chriſtian World. As ſuch*: What is that? As Biſhops of *Rome*? That is not of weight enough to put it upon Trial; as *Heads* of the *Catholick Church*? That he knows is not only denied by us, but by all the *Greek*, *Armenian*, *Neſtorian*, *Abyſſin* Churches; ſo that we dare ſay, it was never allowed in any one Age of the Chriſtian Church: but we need not inſiſt on the proof of this, ſince the late mentioned Authors of the *Roman* Communion have taken ſo great pains, not only to prove the Popes Supremacy to be an Incroachment and Uſurpation in the Church, but that the laying it aſide is neceſſary to the Peace and Unity of it. And until the Divine Inſtitution of the Papal Supremacy be proved, it is to no purpoſe to debate *what manner of Aſſiſtance is promiſed to the Pope in his Decrees*. Our Author is willing to decline the debate about his *perſonal Infallibility, as a matter of Opinion, and not of Faith*; and yet he ſaith, *he doubts not but God doth grant a ſpecial Aſſiſtance to the High Prieſt, for the good of the whole Flock, under the New Law, as he did under the Old, and produces the Inſtance of* Caiaphas, Joh. 11. 51. This is a very ſurprizing way of Reaſoning; for if his Arguments be good from Scripture, he muſt hold the Popes *perſonal Infallibility as a matter of Faith*; and yet one would hardly think he ſhould build an Article of Faith on the inſtance of *Caiaphas*: For what conſequence can be drawn from Gods over-ruling the mind of a very bad man, when he was carrying on a moſt wicked deſign, to utter ſuch words, which

Orig Comment. in Matt. Gr. Lat. p. 275. Cyprian. de Unit. Eccleſiæ. *Hilar.* de Trinit. l. 6. *Hier.* c. Jovin. l. 1. c. 14. in Matt. 16. *Aug.* in Joh. Tr. 118. 124. In Epiſt. Joh. To. 10. Moyens ſurs & honeſtes, &c. p. 34, &c. Entretiens de Philaleth. & Phileren. p. 121. Joh. Launoi. Epiſt. part 5. Reim. Formentino, & Part. 2 Ep. 5 P. 47, &c.

P. 42.

which in the event proved true in another ſenſe than he meant them, that therefore God will give a ſpecial Aſſiſtance to the Pope in determining matters of Faith? Was not *Caiaphas* himſelf the man who propoſed the taking away the Life of Chriſt at that time? Was he aſſiſted in that Council? Did not he determine afterwards Chriſt to be guilty of blaſphemy, and therefore worthy of Death? And is not this a rare Infallibility which is ſuppoſed to be conſiſtent with a Decree to crucifie Chriſt? And doth he in earneſt think ſuch Orders are to be obeyed, whether the ſupreme Paſtor be Infallible or not? For ſo he concludes, *That his ſentence is to be obeyed, whether he be Infallible or no.*

XIX. *Of Diſpenſations.*

HERE the *Miſrepreſenter* ſaith, That a Papiſt believes that the Pope hath Authority to diſpenſe with the Laws of God, and abſolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments. On the other ſide, the *Repreſenter* affirms, *That the Pope has no Authority to diſpenſe with the Law of God, and that there's no power upon Earth can abſolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments*: This matter is not to be determined by the ones affirming, and the others denying: but by finding out, if poſſible, the true ſenſe of the Church of *Rome* about this matter. And there are Three Opinions about it.

De Conceſſ. Præbend. e propoſuit. Abb. c. propoſuit de Conc. Præbend. C. 15. Q. 6. c. Auctoritate.

1. Of thoſe who aſſert, *That the Pope hath a Power of diſpenſing in any Divine Law, except the Articles of Faith.* The Gloſs upon the Canon Law ſaith, That where the Text ſeems to imply, that the Pope cannot diſpenſe againſt the Apoſtle, it is to be underſtood of Articles of Faith. And *Panormitan* ſaith, This Expoſition pleaſes him well; for the Pope may diſpenſe in all other things: *contra Apoſtolum diſpenſat*, ſaith the Gloſs on the Decree: And the *Roman* Editors in the Margin, refer to 34 *Diſt. c. Lector* to prove it. And there indeed the Gloſs is very plain in the caſe, *ſic ergo Papa diſpenſat contra Apoſtolum*: And the *Roman* Correcters there juſtifie it, and ſay it is no abſurd Doctrine as to poſitive Inſtitutions; but the former *notable Gloſs*, as *Panormitan* calls it, ſets down the particulars wherein the Pope may diſpenſe. As 1. Againſt the Apoſtles and their Canons. 2. Againſt

Sum. Angelic. v. diſpenſatio.

gainſt the Old Teſtament. 3. In Vows. 4. In Oaths. The *Summa Angelica* ſaith, the Pope may diſpenſe as to all the Precepts of the Old Teſtament. And *Clavaſius* founds this Power upon the plenitude of the Popes Power, according to that Expreſſion in the Decretal mentioned, that he can, *ex plenitudine Poteſtatis de Jure ſupra Jus diſpenſare*; and without ſuch a Power, he ſaith, God would not have taken that care of his Church, which was to be expected from his Wiſdom. *Jacobatius* brings ſeveral inſtances of this Power in the Pope, and refers to the *Speculator* for more. *Jac. Almain* ſaith, That all the Canoniſts are of Opinion, that the Pope may diſpenſe againſt the Apoſtle; and many of their Divines, but not all: For,

Jacobat. de Concilii l. 5. p. 215.

Almain. de poteſt Eccleſiæ, c. 13.

2. Some of their Divines held *that the Pope could not diſpenſe with the Law of God*, as that implies a proper *relaxation* of the *Law*, but could onely *Authoritatively declare* that the Law did not oblige in ſuch a particular caſe, becauſe an Inferior could not take away the force of a Superiors Law, and otherwiſe there would be no fixed and immutable Rule in the Church; and if the Pope might diſpenſe in one Law of God, he might diſpenſe in the reſt. And of this Opinion were ſome of the moſt eminent School-Divines, as *Thomas Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, *Major*, *Soto*, and *Catharinus*, who at large debates this Queſtion, and denies that the Pope hath any Power to diſpenſe with Gods Law: But then he adds, that the Pope hath a kind of *Prophetical Power* to *declare* in what Caſes the Law doth oblige, and in what not; which he parallels with the power of *declaring* the *Canon of Scripture*; and this he doth not by his own Authority, but by Gods; He confeſſeth the Pope cannot diſpenſe with thoſe Precepts which are of themſelves indiſpenſable; nor alter the Sacraments; but then, ſaith he, there are ſome Divine Laws, which have a general force, but in particular caſes may be diſpenſed with; and in theſe caſes the Law is to be relaxed, ſo that the Relaxation ſeems to come from God himſelf: But he confeſſes this power is not to be often made uſe of; ſo that he makes this power to be no Act of Juriſdiction, but of *Prophetical Interpretation*, as he calls it; and he brings the inſtance of *Caiaphas* to this purpoſe: And he adds, that the difference between the Divines and *Canoniſts* was but in Terms; for the *Canoniſts* were in the right as to the power, and the Divines in the manner of explaining it.

Catharin. c. Cajetan. 6. p. 524.

3. Others have thought this too looſe a way of explaining the Popes power, and therefore they ſay, *That the Pope hath not a bare declaratory Power, but a real Power of diſpenſing in a proper ſenſe in particular Caſes*: For ſay they, the other is no act of Juriſdiction, but of Diſcretion, and may belong to other men as well as to the Pope; but this they look on as more agreeable to the Popes Authority and Commiſſion; and a bare declaratory power would not be ſufficient for the Churches Neceſſity; as *Sanchez* ſhews at large, and quotes many Authors for this Opinion; and *Sayr* more; and he ſaith *the Practice of the Church cannot be juſtified without it.* Which *Suarez* much inſiſts upon; and without it, he ſaith, *the Church hath fallen into intolerable Errors*; and *it is evident*, he ſaith, *the Church hath granted real Diſpenſations, and not meer Declarations.* And he founds it upon Chriſts promiſe to *Peter*, *To thee will I give the Keys*, and the charge to him, *Feed my ſheep.* But then he explains this Opinion, by ſaying that it is no formal Diſpenſation with the Law of God, but the matter of the Law is changed or taken away.

Sanchez de Matrim. l. 8. Dif. 6. n. 5. Sayr. Clavis Reg. l. 6. c. 11. *Suarez* de vot. l. 6. c. 9. n. 7, 8, 9, 17.

Thus I have briefly laid together the different Opinions in the Church of *Rome* about this power of diſpenſing with the Law of God, from which it appears, that they do all conſent in the thing, but differ only in the manner of explaining it.

And I am therefore afraid our *Repreſenter* is a very unſtudied Divine, and doth not well underſtand their own Doctrine, or he would never have talked ſo boldly and unskilfully in this matter.

As to what he pretends, that *their Church teaches that every Lye is a Sin*, &c. it doth not reach the caſe; For the Queſtion is not, Whether their Church teach men to lye, but, Whether there be not ſuch a power in the Church, as by altering the Nature of things, may not make that not to be a Lye, which otherwiſe would be one: As their Church teaches that Men ought not to break their Vows; yet no one among them queſtions, but the Pope may diſſolve the Obligation of a Vow altho it be made to God himſelf. Let him ſhew then, how the Pope comes to have a power to releaſe a Vow made to God, and not to have a power to releaſe the Obligation to veracity among men.

Again,

Again, We do not charge them with delivering any ſuch Doctrine, *That men may have Diſpenſations to lye and forſwear themſelves at pleaſure*; for we know this Diſpenſing power is to be kept up as a great Myſtery, and not to be made uſe of, but upon weighty and urgent cauſes, of great conſequence and benefit to the Church, as their Doctors declare. But as to all matters of fact which he alludes to, I have nothing to ſay to them; for our debate is only, whether there be ſuch a power of Diſpenſation allowed in the Church of *Rome*, or not? Pag. 45.

XX. *Of the Depoſing Power.*

TO bring this matter into as narrow a compaſs as may be, I ſhall firſt take notice of his Conceſſions, which will ſave us a labour of proofs.

1. He yields *That the Depoſing and King-killing power hath been maintained by ſome Canoniſts and Divines of his Church, and that it is in their Opinion lawful, and annexed to the Papal Chair.* Pag. 46.

2. *That ſome Popes have endeavoured to act according to this Power.*

But then he denies *that this Doctrine appertains to the Faith of his Church, and is to be believed by all of that Communion.* And more than that, he ſaith, *The affirming of it is a malicious calumny, a down-right falſity.*

Let us now calmly debate the matter, Whether according to the received principles of the Church of *Rome*, this be only a particular opinion of ſome Popes and Divines, or be to be received as a matter of Faith. The Queſtion is not,

Whether thoſe who deny it, do account it an Article of Faith; for we know they do not: But whether upon the principles of the Church of *Rome* they are not bound to do it.

I ſhall only, to avoid cavilling, proceed upon the principles owned by our Author himſelf, *viz.*

1 *That the ſenſe of Scripture, as underſtood by the community of Chriſtians in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles, is to be taken from the preſent Church.* Pag. 29.

2. *That by the preſent Church he underſtands the Paſtors and Prelates aſſembled in Councils, who are appointed by Chriſt and his Apo-* Pag. 34.

ſtles for the deciſion of controverſies; and that they have infallible aſſiſtance.

P. 40, 41. 3. *That the Pope as the Head of the Church, hath a particular Aſſiſtance promiſed him, with a ſpecial regard to his Office and Function.*

If therefore it appear that Popes and Councils have declared this Depoſing Doctrine, and they have received other things as Articles of Faith upon the ſame Declarations, Why ſhould they then ſtick at yielding this to be an Article of Faith, as well as the other?

It is not denied, that I can find, that Popes and Councils for ſeveral Ages have aſſerted and exerciſed the Depoſing power; but it is alledged againſt theſe Decrees and Acts, 1. That they were not grounded upon Univerſal Tradition. 2. That they had not Univerſal Reception.

Now, if theſe be ſufficient to overthrow the Definitions of Councils, let us conſider the conſequences of it.

1. Then every man is left to examine the Decrees of Councils, whether they are to be embraced or not; for he is to judg whether they are founded on Univerſal Tradition; and ſo he is not to take the ſenſe of the preſent Church for his Guide, but the Univerſal Church from Chriſts time: which overthrows a Fundamental principle of the *Roman* Church.

2. Then he muſt reject the pretended Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, if they could ſo notoriouſly err in a matter of ſo great conſequence to the peace of Chriſtendom as this was; and conſequently their authority could not be ſufficient to declare any Articles of Faith, and ſo all perſons muſt be left at liberty to believe as they ſee cauſe, notwithſtanding the Definitions made by Popes and Councils.

3. Then he muſt believe the Guides of the *Roman* Church to have been miſtaken, not once or twice, but to have perſiſted in it for Five hundred years: which muſt take away, not only infallibility, but any kind of Reverence to the authority of it. For whatever may be ſaid as to thoſe who have depended on Princes, or favour their parties againſt the Guides of the Church, it cannot be denied that for ſo long time the leading party in that Church did aſſert and maintain the Depoſing power; and therefore *Leſſius* truly underſtood this matter, when he ſaid, *That there*

there was ſcarce any Article of the Chriſtian Faith, the denial whereof was more dangerous to the Church, or did precipitate Men more into Hereſie and Hatred of the Church, than this of the Depoſing Power; for, he ſays, *they could not maintain their Churches Authority without it.* Diſcuſſio Decreti Magni Concil. Lateran. p. 89.

And he reckons up theſe ill Conſequences of denying it. P. 90, *&c.*

1. That the *Roman* Church hath erred for at leaſt five hundred years, in a matter fundamental as to Government, and of great Moment: Which is worſe than an Error about *Sacraments*, as Penance, Extream Unction, *&c.* and yet thoſe who deny the Church can err in one, hold that it hath erred in a greater matter.

2. That it hath not only erred, but voluntarily and out of Ambition, perverting, out of deſign, the Doctrine of the Primitive Church and Fathers concerning the Power of the Church, and bringing in another contrary to it, againſt the Right and Authority of Princes; which were a grievous ſin.

3. That it made knowingly, unrighteous Decrees, to draw perſons from their Allegiance to Princes; and ſo they became the cauſes of many Seditions and Rebellions, and all the ill conſequences of them, under a ſhew of Piety and Religion.

4. That the Churches Decrees, Commands, Judgments and Cenſures may be ſafely contemned as Null, and containing intolerable Errors. And that it may require ſuch things which good Subjects are bound to diſobey.

5. That *Gregory* VII. in the Canon *Nos Sanctorum, &c. Urban* II. *Gregory* IX. the Councils of *Lateran* under *Alex.* III and *Innocent* III. the Councils of *Lyons*, of *Vienna*, of *Conſtance*, of *Lateran* under *Leo* X. and of *Trent*, have all grievouſly and enormouſly erred about this matter; For that it was the Doctrine of them all, he ſhews at large; and ſo Seven General Councils loſe their Infallibility at one blow.

6. That the Gates of Hell have prevailed againſt the Church: For the true Church could never teach ſuch pernicious Doctrine as this muſt be, if it be not true. And if it erred in this, it might as well err in any other Doctrine, and ſo Men are not bound to believe or obey it.

7. That Princes and all Laymen have juſt Cauſe to withdraw from their Church; becauſe it ſhewed it ſelf to be governed by a ſpirit of Ambition, and not by the Spirit of God; and not only

ly ſo, but they may juſtly proſecute all that maintain a Doctrine ſo pernicious to Government, if it be not true.

Let us now ſee what our Author ſaith to clear this from being a Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*.

1. *That for the few Authors that are abettors of this Doctrine, there are of his Communion Three times the number that publickly diſown all ſuch Authority.*

If this be true, it is not much for the Reputation of their Church, That there ſhould be ſuch a number of thoſe who are liable to all theſe dreadful conſequences, which *Leſſius* urges upon the deniers of it: But is it poſſible to believe there ſhould be ſo few followers of ſo many Popes, and Seven General Councils, owned for ſuch by the diſowners of this Doctrine, except the *Lateran* under *Leo* 10? The poor *Eaſtern* Chriſtians are condemned for *Hereticks* by the Church of *Rome*, for refuſing to ſubmit to the Decrees of one General Council, either that of *Epheſus*, or of *Chalcedon*: and they plead for themſelves, That there was a miſinterpretation of their meaning, or not right underſtanding one another about the difference of *Nature* and *Perſon*, which occaſioned thoſe Decrees. I would fain know, whether thoſe Churches which do not embrace the Decrees of thoſe Councils, are in a ſtate of Hereſie or not? If they be, then what muſt we think of ſuch who reject the Decrees of Seven General Councils, one after another, and give far leſs probable accounts of the Proceedings of thoſe Councils in their Definitions, than the other do.

Diſcuſſ. Diſcuſſ. Part 3. Sect. 3. p. 1.

Philip. a SS. Trinit. Itiner. Orient. l. 5. c. 5. Clem. Galan. Concil. Eccl. Arm. Qu. 2. SS. 3. p. 92.

2. He ſaith, *Thoſe who have condemned it, have not been in the leaſt ſuſpected of their Religion, or of denying any Article of Faith.* Let any one judg of this by *Leſſius* his Conſequences: And the Author of the firſt Treatiſe againſt the Oath of Allegiance ſaith in plain Terms, *That the Opinion that the Pope hath no ſuch Power, is erroneous in Faith, as well as temerarious and impious*; And he proves it by this ſubſtantial argument; Becauſe they who hold it, muſt ſuppoſe that the Church hath been for ſome time in a damnable Error of Belief, and Sin of Practice: And he not only proves that it was defined by Popes and Councils, but for a long time univerſally received; and that no one Author can be produced before *Calvins* time, that denied this Power abſolutely, or in any caſe whatſoever. *But a few Authors that are Abettors of*

Jeſuits Loyalty, firſt Treatiſe, p. 1, &c.

of it, saith our *Representer*: *Not one total Dissenter for a long time*, saith the other: And which of these is the true Representer? *The deniers of it not in the least suspected of their Religion*, saith one: *Their Opinion is erroneous in Faith, temerarious and impious*, saith the other. And a Professor of *Lovain*, now living, hath undertaken to shew, that the number is far greater of those who assert this Doctrine, than of those who deny it.

3. *If we charge their Church with this Opinion, may not they as well charge ours with the like; since Propositions as dangerous were condemned at* Oxford, July 26. 1683. *as held not by* Jesuits, *but by some among our selves?* This is the force of his Reasoning: But we must desire the Reader to consider the great disparity of the case. We cannot deny, that there have been men of ill Minds, and disloyal Principles, Factious and Disobedient, Enemies to the Government, both in Church and State; but have these Men ever had that countenance from the Doctrines of the Guides of our Church, which the deposing Doctrine hath had in the Church of *Rome*? To make the case parallel, he must suppose our Houses of Convocation to have several times declared these damnable Doctrines, and given Encouragement to Rebels to proceed against their Kings, and the University of *Oxford* to have condemned them; for this is truly the case in the Church of *Rome*; the Popes and Councils have owned, and approved, and acted by the Deposing Principle: but the Universities of *France*, of late years, have condemned it. How come the Principles of the Regicides among us to be parallel'd with this Doctrine, when the Principles of our Church are so directly contrary to them; and our Houses of Convocation would as readily condemn any such damnable Doctrines, as the University of *Oxford*? And all the World knows how repugnant such Principles are to those of the Church of *England*; and none can be Rebels to their Prince, but they must be false to our Church.

P. 47, 48. *Auctoritas sedis apostolicæ vindicata adversus Natal. Alexand. per Francisc. D. Enghien. Colon. A.D.* 1684.

As to the personal Loyalty of many persons in that Church, as I have no Reason to question it, so it is not proper for me to debate it, if I did; since our business is not concerning Persons, but Doctrines; and it was of old observed concerning the *Epicureans*, That though their principles did overthrow any true Friendship, yet many of them made excellent Friends.

XXI. *Of Communion in One Kind.*

FOR our better proceeding in this Controverſie, I ſhall ſet down the State of it as clearly as I can.

1. The Queſtion is not, VVhether the firſt Inſtitution of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt by Jeſus Chriſt, were in one Kind, or two: for all confeſs it was under both Kinds.

2. It is not, VVhether both Kinds are not ſtill neceſſary for the due Celebration of it; for it is granted that both Kinds are neceſſary to be upon the Altar, or elſe there could be no compleat Sacrifice.

3. It is not, Whether the people may be wholly excluded from both Kinds, and ſo the Sacriſice only remain: for they grant that the people are bound to communicate in one Kind.

4. It is not concerning any peculiar aad extraordinary Caſes, where no Wine is to be had, or there be a particular Averſion to it, or any ſuch thing, where poſitive Inſtitutions may be reaſonably preſumed to have no force: But concerning the publick and ſolemn Celebration, and participation of it in the Chriſtian Church.

5. It is not concerning the meer diſuſe or neglect of it, But concerning the lawfulneſs of Excluding the people from both Kinds, by the Churches prohibition, notwithſtanding the Inſtitution of it by Chriſt in both Kinds, with a command to keep up the Celebration of it to his ſecond coming.

Here now conſiſts the point in Controverſie, Whether the Church being obliged to keep up the Inſtitution in both Kinds, be not equally obliged to diſtribute both as our Saviour did, to as many as partake of it? Our Author not denying the Inſtitution, or the continuance of it, ſaith, *Our Saviour left it indifferent to receive it in one Kind, or both.* And that is the point to be examined.

1. He ſaith, *Chriſt delivered it to his Apoſtles, who only were then preſent, and whom he made Prieſts juſt before: yet he gave no command that it ſhould be ſo received by all the Faithful.*

But were not the Apoſtles all the Faithful then preſent? I pray in what capacity did they then receive it? As Prieſts?

How

How did they receive the Bread before the *hoc facite?* As Priests or as Faithful? It is ridiculous to suppose the *hoc facite* changed their capacity; and if it did, it only relates to consecrating, and not to receiving: but if Christ gave it only to the Apostles as Priests, then for all that I can see, the People are not at all concerned in one kind or other; but it was intended only for Priests: If the people be concerned, how came they to be so? Where is there any command but what refers to the first Institution? And it had been more plausible, according to this Answer, to exclude the People wholly, than to admit them to one Kind, and to debar them the other.

2. *Christ attributes the obtaining Life Everlasting, the end of the Institution, sometimes to receiving under both Kinds, sometimes under one,* John 6. 51, 57, 58. He could not easily have thought of any thing more against himself; for our Saviour there makes it as necessary to drink his Blood, as to eat his Flesh, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you:* If this be understood of the Sacrament, as he saith, How is it possible for him to make the Cup indifferent? Unless it be indifferent whether the People be saved or not. S. John 6. 51.

3. *Christ himself administred the Sacrament to some of his Disciples under one kind only,* Luke 24. 30. But is he sure Christ did then administer the Sacrament to them? Or that if he did, the Cup was not implied, since breaking of Bread, when taken for an ordinary Meal in Scripture, doth not exclude drinking at it? *But S.* Augustin he saith, (l. 49. *de Consensu Evangel.*) *understands that place of the Sacrament.* If he doth, it cannot be where he saith; for S. *Augustin* wrote but Four Book of that Subject: but l. 3. 25. he doth say something towards it; yet S. *Augustin* in another place supposes that these Disciples did both eat and drink. *The Disciples did not know him, but in the breaking of Bread; and truely he that doth not eat and drink Judgment to himself, doth in the breaking of Bread own Christ.* Where it is plain, that he applies both, to the breaking of Bread here spoken of. Tract. 2. in Epist. S. Joh.

4. He saith, *it was the Custom of the Primitive Christians to give it under one kind to Children, the Sick, and to Men in a journey.* I would he had produced his Authorities to prove these things; for I can bring several to prove the direct contrary as to Chil-

dren, and ſick Perſons, and Travellers, and not only Ancient Writers, but the moſt Learned of their own Church. And therefore I cannot but wonder to find him ſaying, *This was atteſted by all Ancient Writers, and Modern Hiſtorians.* But I have ever found thoſe have been moſt miſtaken, who produce *all Writers and Hiſtorians*; when it may be, there is not one that ſpeaks home to the buſineſs. At leaſt, we have here none mentioned, and therefore none to examin; and it would be too hard a task to ſearch *All.*

5. He adds to this extravagancy, in ſaying, *That Receiving in one or both kinds, was indifferent for the firſt Four hundred year*; when the contrary is ſo manifeſt, that the moſt ingenious of their own Writers confeſs it. If any Perſons did carry home one kind (which is very queſtionable; for *Baronius* and *Albaſpinæus* ſay, they carried both Kinds) to receive it in times of Perſecution, at what ſeaſon they thought fit afterwards; This ought not to be ſet up againſt the general and conſtant Rule of the Church; which is atteſted, not only by *Caſſander* and ſuch like, but even by *Salmero*, *Ruardus Tapperus*, and *Lindanus*, who make no ſcruple of ſaying, The publick Celebration in the Primitive Church was in both Kinds. But then, how is it poſſible for us to judg better, what they thought themſelves bound to do, than what they conſtantly obſerved in all their publick Celebrations? The Church is not accountable for the particular Fancies or Superſtitions of Men; but what was obſerved in all publick Offices, we have reaſon to think the Church thought it ſelf obliged ſo to do, out of regard to the Inſtitution of Chriſt. And to ſhew how Univerſal this Obſervation was in the Church, thoſe who give account of the *Eaſtern* Church ſay, That the *Greeks*, *Neſtorians*, *Armenians*, *Maronites*, *Cophtites* and *Abyſſins*, do all obſerve it ſtill, *viz.* That the publick Communicants do partake of both Kinds. And not one of all theſe Churches, but think themſelves bound to obſerve it, out of regard to the Inſtitution of Chriſt; and why then ſhould any think the Primitive Church thought it indifferent?

Cotovic. Itiner Hieroſolymit. l. 2. c. 6. Hiſtoir. Critique, p. 14.

6. *The firſt Precept of receiving under both Kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope* Leo, A. D. 443. *and confirmed by* Gelaſius, A. D. 490. This is a great miſtake, for *Leo* gave no Precept about it; but only told the People how they might certainly diſcover the *Manichees*, for they would conform in other things, but

but they would not taste of the Wine: which argued, that all other Communicants did then partake in both Kinds. *Gelasius* not only confirms the Custom then used, but he saith, *That it is Sacriledg to divide that Holy Mystery.* And surely he did not account Sacriledg an Indifferent thing.

7. Lastly he saith, *That those who receive in one Kind, are truely partakers of the whole Sacrament.* This is a new way of Concomitancy; We used to hear of *Whole Christ* under either Species, and that *Whole Christ* was therefore received; But how comes it to be *the whole Sacrament*, which consists of two distinct Parts? And if it be a Sacrifice, the Blood must be separated from the Body, else the Blood of Christ is not considered as shed, and so the Notion of the Sacrifice will be lost: Which is our new Head. P. 52.

XXII. *Of the MASS.*

UNder this Head, which is thought of so great Consequence in the *Roman* Church, I expected a fuller Representation than I here find; as about the *Opus Operatum*, *i. e.* how far the meer Act is effectual: About their *Solitary Masses*, when no Person receives but the Priest; About the People having so little to do, or understand, in all the other parts of the *Mass*; About the Rites and Ceremonies of the *Mass*, how useful and important they are; About reconciling the present Canon of the *Mass*, with the present Practises; About offering up *Masses* for the honour of Saints. All which we find in the Council of *Trent*, but are omitted by our *Representer*; Who speaks of the *Mass*, as tho there were no Controversy about it, but only concerning the Sacrifice there supposed to be offered up, and which he is far from true Representing: For the Council of *Trent* not only affirms *a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice to be there offered up for the quick and dead*, but denounces *Anathema's* against those that deny it. So that the Question is not, Whether the Eucharist may not in the sense of Antiquity be allowed to be *a Commemorative Sacrifice*, as it takes in the whole Action: but whether in the *Mass* there be such a Representation made to God of Christ's Sacrifice, as to be it self a true and Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of the Quick and the Dead? Sess 22. cap 2. cap. 1, 2, 3, &c.

Now, all that our *Repreſenter* ſaith to the purpoſe, is,

P. 53. 1. *That Chriſt bequeathed his Body and Blood at his laſt Supper, under the Species of Bread and Wine, not only a Sacrament, but alſo a Sacrifice.* I had thought it had been more proper to have offered a Sacrifice, than to have bequeathed it. And this ought to have been proved, as the Foundation of this Sacrifice, *viz.* That Chriſt did at his laſt Supper offer up his Body and Blood, as a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God. And then what need his ſuffering on the Croſs?

2. *He gave this in charge to his Apoſtles, as the firſt and chief Prieſts of the New-Teſtament, and to their Succeſſors, to offer.* But Where? When? and How? For we read nothing at all of it in Scripture. *Chriſt indeed did bid them do the ſame thing he had there done in his laſt Supper.* But did he then offer up himſelf, or not? If not, How can the Sacrifice be drawn from his Action; If he did, it is impoſſible to prove the neceſſity of his dying afterwards.

3. *This Sacrifice was never queſtioned till of late years.* We ſay, it was never determined to be a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, till of late. We do not deny the Fathers interpreting *Mal.* 1. 11. of an Offering under the Goſpel; but they generally underſtand it of Spiritual and Euchariſtical Sacrifices; and although ſome of them, by way of Accommodation, do apply it to the Euchariſt, yet not one of them doth make it a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, which was the thing to be proved: For, we have no mind to diſpute about Metaphorical Sacrifices, when the Council of *Trent* ſo poſitively decrees it to be a *True, Proper, and Propitiatory Sacrifice.*

XXIII. *Of* PURGATORY.

HEre our Author begins with proving from Scripture and Antiquity, and then undertakes to explain the Doctrine of *Purgatory* from ſubſtantial Reaſons.

1. As to his Proof from Scripture.

1. Is that from 2 *Maccab.* c. 12. where he ſaith, *Money was ſent to* Jeruſalem, *that Sacrifices might be offered for the ſlain; and 'tis recommended as a Holy Cogitation, to pray for the dead.*

To

To this, which is the main foundation of *Purgatory*, I answer, 1. It can never prove such a *Purgatory* as our Author asserts; For he supposes *a Sinner reconciled to God, as to eternal Punishment*, before he be capable of *Purgatory*; but here can be no such supposition; for these Men died in the sin of *Achan*, which was not known till their Bodies were found amongst the slain. Here was no Confession, or any sign of Repentance, and therefore if it proves any thing, it is *deliverance from Eternal Punishment*, and for such as dye in their Sins without any shew of Repentance. P. 57.

2. We must distinguish the Fact of *Judas* from the interpretation of *Jason*, or his Epitomizer. The Fact of *Judas* was according to the strictness of the Law, which required in such Cases *a Sin Offering*; and that is all which the *Greek* implies. Ἀπέστειλεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα περσφορὰν περὶ ἁμαρτίας θυσίαν. And so *Leo Allatius* confesses all the best *Greek* Copies agree; and he reckons Twelve of them. Now what doth this imply, but that *Judas* remembring the severe punishment of this Sin in the Case of *Achan*, upon the People, sent a Sin offering to *Jerusalem*? But saith *Leo Allatius*, *It was the sin of those men that were slain.* I grant it. But the Question is, Whether *the Sin-offering* respected the dead or the living? For the Law in such a Case requred a *Sin-offering for the Congregation.* And why should not we believe so punctual a Man for the Law, as *Judas*, did strictly observe it in this point? *But the Author of the Book of* Maccabees *understands it of those that were slain.* I do not deny it; but then, 3. We have no Reason to rely upon his Authority in this matter; which I shall make appear by a parallel Instance. He doth undoubtedly commend the fact of *Razias* in *Killing himself* (2 Macc. 14. 42.) when he saith he did it, Εὐψύχως *like a brave Man*; and if he had thought it a fault in him, he would never have given such a Character of it, but he would have added something of Caution after it. And it is no great advantage to *Purgatory*, for him that commends Self-murder to have introduced it. The most probable account I can give of it is, That the *Alexandrian Jews*, of whose number *Jason* of *Cyrene* seems to have been, had taken in several of the Philosophical Opinions, especially the *Platonists*, into their Religion, as appears by *Philo*; and *Bellarmine* himself confesses, that *Plato* held a *Purgatory*: and they were ready to apply

Leo Allat. de Purgat p. 889.

Levit. 4. 13.

Bellar. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 8.

ply what related to the Law, to their Platonick Notions. So here the Law appointed a Sin-offering with respect to the Living; but *Jason* would needs have this refer to the dead; and then sets down his own remark upon it, That *it was a holy Cogitation to pray for the dead*; as our Author renders it. If it were *holy* with respect to the Law, there must be some ground for it in the Law. And that we appeal to; and do not think any particular Fancies sufficient to introduce such a Novelty as this was, which had no Foundation either in the Law or the Prophets. And it would be strange for a new Doctrine to be set up, when the Spirit of Prophecy was ceased among them.

P. 55. *But S.* August. *held these Books for Canonical*, and saith, *they are so received by the Church, l.* 18. *de Civit. Dei.* To answer this, it is sufficient to observe, not only the different opinions of others before mentioned as to these Books: But that as *Canus* notes, *it was then lawful to doubt of their Authority*: And he goes as low as *Gregory* I. Whom he denies not to have rejected them. And I hope we may set the Authority of one against the other; especially when S. *Augustin* himself, being pressed hard with the fact of *Razias*, confesses, 1. *That the Jews have not the Book of* Maccabees *in their Canon, as they have the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, to whom our Lord gave Testimony as to his Witnesses.* Which is an evident Proof, he thought not these Books sufficient to ground a Doctrine upon, which was not found in the other. 2. *That however this Book was not unprofitably received by the Church, if it be soberly read and heard.* Which implies a greater Caution than S. *Augustin* would ever have given, concerning a Book he believed truly Canonical. But saith *Bellarmine, his meaning is only to keep men from imitating the Example of Razias*; whereas that which they pressed S. *Augustin* with, was not meerly the Fact, but the *Character* that is given of it. *Sanctarum Scripturarum Auctoritate laudatus est Razias*, are their very Words in S. *Augustin.* And therefore the caution relates to the Books, and not meerly to his Example. And he lessens the Character given by the Author, when he saith, *He chose to dye nobly*; *It had been better*, saith he, *to have dyed humbly. But the other is the Elogium given in the Heathen Histories, and better becomes brave Heathens, than true Martyrs.* Can any one now think S. *Augustin* believed this Writer Divine-

Can. l. 2. c. 10. ad 4.

Aug. cont. ad Epist. Gaudent l. 2. c. 23.

De Purgat. l. 1. c. 3.

ly

ly inſpired, or his Doctrine ſufficient to ground a point of Faith upon? And I wonder they ſhould not every jot as well commend *Self-murder* as an *Heroical Act*, as prove the Doctrine of *Purgatory* from theſe words of *Jaſon*, or his Epitomizer. For the Argument from the Authority of the Book, will hold as ſtrongly for one as the other. And yet this is the *Achilles* for *Purgatory*; which *Natalis Alexander* (whom our Author follows in this matter) ſaith, *is a Demonſtrative Place againſt thoſe that deny it.* But I muſt proceed. Natal. Alex. Sec. 4. Diſſ. 4. P. 56.

2. *Purgatory is plainly intimated by our Saviour*, Matt. 12. 32. *Whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy-Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. By which words, Chriſt evidently ſuppoſes, that ſome ſins are forgiven in the world to come.* I am ſo far from diſcerning this plain intimation, that I wonder how any came to think of it out of this place. Well! *But doth it not hence follow, that Sins may be forgiven in the world to come?* Not near ſo plainly, as that Sins will not be forgiven in the World to come. *Not that particular Sin, but others may*; How doth that appear? What intimation is there that any Sins not forgiven here, ſhall be forgiven there? Or that any Sins here remitted as to the Eternal Puniſhment, ſhall be there remitted as to the Temporal? And without ſuch a kind of Remiſſion, nothing can be inferred from hence. *But if there be a Remiſſion in another World, it can be neither in Heaven nor Hell, therefore it muſt be in Purgatory.* But thoſe who own a Remiſſion of Sin in another World, ſay it will be on the Day of Judgment: For the actual Deliverance of the Juſt from Puniſhment, may be not improperly called the full Remiſſion of their Sins. So S. *Auguſtin*, whom he quotes, plainly ſaith, *Si nulla remitterentur in judicio illo noviſſimo, &c.* c. *Julian*, l. 6. c. 5. where it is evident S. *Auguſtin* takes this place to relate to the Day of Judgment; and ſo in the other, (*De Civit. Dei l.* 21. c. 24.) But as he ſuppoſed a Remiſſion, ſo he did a Purgation as *by Fire* in that day. *In illo judicio pœnas quaſdam purgatorias futuras. De Civit. Dei l.* 20. *c.* 25. And ſo he is to be underſtood on *Pſal.* 37. to which he applies 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. But our Author was very much out, when he ſaith S. *Auguſtin* applied 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. to ſome place of temporal Chaſtiſement in another World, when *Bellarmin* ſets himſelf to confute S. *Auguſtin* about it, as underſtanding it of this World: And therefore Bell. de An. Chriſti l. 4. c. 13.

he

he hath little cauſe to boaſt of St. *Auguſtins* Authority about *Purgatory*, unleſs he had brought ſomething more to the purpoſe out of him. His other Teſtimonies of Antiquity are not worth conſidering; which he borrows from *Natalis Alexander*: that of *Dionyſius Areopag. Eccl. Hierarch.* c. 7. is a known Counterfeit, and Impertinent, relating to a Region of Reſt and Happineſs. And ſo do *Tertullians Oblations for the Dead*, *De Cor. Milit.* c. 3. For they were Euchariſtical, as appears by the Ancient Liturgies, being made for the greateſt Saints. St. *Cyprian*, Ep. 66. ſpeaks of *an Oblation for the Dead*: and he there mentions the *Natalitia* of the Martyrs: but by comparing that with his *Epiſt.* 33. it will be found that he ſpeaks of the *Anniverſary Commemoration of the Dead*, which ſignifies nothing to Purgatory: for the beſt men were put into it: and St. *Cyprian* threatens it as a Puniſhment to be left out of the *Diptychs*: but ſurely it is none to eſcape Purgatory: *Arnobius l.* 4. only ſpeaks of *praying for the Dead*, which we deny not to have been then uſed in the Church, not with reſpect to any temporary pains in *Purgatory*, but to the day of Judgment: And therein lies the true ſtate of the Controverſie, with reſpect to Antiquity: which is not, Whether any ſolemn prayers were not then made for the dead; but whether thoſe prayers did relate to their deliverance out of a ſtate of Puniſhment before the Day of Judgment. For whatever ſtate Souls were then ſuppoſed to be in before the great Day, if there could be no deliverance till the Day of Judgment, it ſignifies nothing to the preſent Queſtion.

As to the Viſion of *Perpetua* concerning her Brother *Dinocrates* who died at Seven Years old, being baptized, it is hardly reconcilable to their own Doctrine, to ſuppoſe ſuch a Soul in Purgatory: I will not deny that *Perpetua* did think ſhe ſaw him in a worſe condition: and thought likewiſe that by her Prayers ſhe brought him into a better; for ſhe ſaw him playing like little children: and then ſhe awaked, and concluded that ſhe had given him eaſe: but is it indeed come to this, that ſuch a Doctrine as Purgatory muſt be built on ſuch a Foundation as this? I do not call in queſtion the Acts of *Perpetua*, nor her ſincerity in relating her Dream: but muſt the Church build her Doctrines upon the Dreams or Viſions of Young Ladies, tho very devout? for *Ubia Perpetua* was then but Twenty Two, as ſhe ſaith her ſelf. But none are to be blamed, who make uſe of the beſt ſupports their Cauſe will afford.

It

It is time now to see what strength of Reason he offers for *Purgatory*. 1. He saith, *When a sinner is reconciled to God, tho the Eternal punishment due to his sins is always remitted, yet there sometimes remains a temporal penalty to be undergone; as in the case of the* Israelites, *and* David. But doth it hence follow, that there is a temporal penalty that must be undergone either here or hereafter, without which there will be no need of *Purgatory*? Who denies, that God in this Life, for example sake, may punish those whose sins he hath promised to remit as to another World? This is therefore a very slender Foundation. 2. *There are some sins of their own nature light and venial.* I will not dispute that; but suppose there be, must Men go then into Purgatory for mere Venial Sins? What a strange Doctrine doth this appear to any Mans Reasons? That God should forgive the greater sins, and require so severe a punishment for sins in their own Nature venial, *i. e.* so inconsiderable in their Opinion, that no man is bound to confess them; which do not interrupt a state of Grace; which require only an implicit detestation of them, which do not deserve eternal punishment; which may be remitted by Holy Water, or a Bishops Blessing, as their Divines agree. 3. *That to all sins some penalty is due to the Justice of God.* And what follows from hence but the necessity of Christs Satisfaction; but how doth it appear, that after the Expiation of Sin by Christ, and the remission of eternal punishment, there still remains a necessity of farther satisfaction for such a temporal penalty in another World? 4. *That generally speaking few men depart out of this Life, but either with the guilt of venial sins, or obnoxious to some temporal punishment*; No doubt all men are obnoxious by their sins to the punishment of another World; but that is not the point, but whether God hath declared, That altho he remits the eternal punishment, he will not the temporal; and altho he will forgive thousands of pounds, he will not the pence and farthings we owe to him: But if Mortal Sins be remitted as to the guilt, and Venial do not hinder a State of Grace, what room is there for vindictive Justice in *Purgatory*?

Pag. 57.

S. Th part. 3. q. 87. art 3. in cor. v Marsil. Column. Hydragiolog. Sect. 7. c. 3. n. 32. Sect. 3. c. 2. 11. 15. 29. c. 3. n. 1. Bell. de Cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 7. *Sect.* secundo.

Yet this is the Doctrine which so much weight is laid upon; that *Bellarmine* saith, *They must go directly to Hell, who do not believe Purgatory*. If this be true, why was it not put into the

De Purgatorio l. 1. c. 11. SS. Hæc. sint.

Representation, that we might understand the danger of not believing so credible, so reasonable a Doctrine as this? But we believe it to be a much more dangerous thing to condemn others for not believing a Doctrine which hath so very slender a pretence either to Scripture or Reason.

XXIV. *Of Praying in an unknown Tongue.*

THE Question in short is, Whether the Church Service, at which persons are bound to assist, ought not to be in a Language understood by those who are bound to assist?

P. 59 For our Author grants, *That a Papist is bound to assist at the Church-Service, and to hear* Mass; but he is not bound to understand the Words there spoken.

This is a plain state of the case; and one would have thought St. *Pauls* Discourse about Edification in the Church-Service, and a known Tongue, and the Primitive practice, had deserved a little consideration, but not a Word is said to either of them; and the whole is so managed, as tho there had been no Rule, or any appearance of practice to the contrary. But I must consider what he doth say,

1. *The Mass is a Sacrifice*: And what then? Have they no other Church-Service but the Mass? What then becomes of their Breviaries, Litanies, and all other Offices? But suppose the Priests Office in the *Mass*, be to offer the Sacrifice; are there no Prayers in the Canon of the *Mass*, wherein the people are concerned? Why must not they understand what they are required to assist in *Prayer* for? If they have *English* Books, as he saith, to teach them every part and Ceremony P. 61. of the *Mass*, why not as well the Prayers in the *Mass*, wherein they are to joyn? They tell us, *It is unseasonable then for the People to say their Beads, and other Devotions*: And I suppose as unseasonable to talk, or think of other matters. Why then should not they know what it is they are to do, and what Petitions they are then to make to God? Are there no Responses to be made? No Lessons to be read? No Creed to be professed? Doth not the Priest speak to the People to pray, and they answer him? Is there no Thanksgiving after the Communion which the people is concerned

cerned in? We are as much for *their Devout Affections*, as they can be, but we think they are not hindred by understanding what they are about: We cannot but wonder, that any man should say, *That it nothing concerns his Devotion, that the Mass is in Latin*, if he understand it not. Is it no part of Devotion to joyn in the publick Prayers, not meerly by rote, but from a due apprehension of the matter contained in them? He requires, *That they accompany the Priest in Prayer and Spirit*: And why not in understanding also? *But the Church hath so ordered it*: And that is the thing we complain of, as done against St. *Paul*, against the Primitive Church, against the natural sense of Mankind, who think it is fit for them to know what they do, especially in the Worship of God: *But it is to preserve Unity*: Methinks however Unity in Spirit and Understanding is better than without it: *There are other good Reasons*: I know not one good one; and if there were more, he would have produced them: *The greatest part is said in a low voice, that it is not possible he should hear it*: And to what purpose should it be spoken louder, if they are not to understand it? But why so low in publick? Yet the people might have Books, and joyn, if they understood what was said. But why should not the rest be understood, which is spoken as if it were. P. 60. P. 61.

2. As to other Offices, he saith, *He is taught, that he may perform them in a Language which he understands not, with great benefit to his Soul, and the acceptance of God, if at those occasions he endeavours to raise his thoughts to Heaven, and fix his heart upon his Maker.* But the Question is not, Whether a Man may not have devout Thoughts at that time, but whether he can perform his part in the publick Offices, with true Devotion, without Understanding? For the publick Offices of Devotion were designed for the uniting the Hearts and Desires of the people in the same things. It is not, Whether one Man may not pray for Heaven, and another for fair Weather, and another for pardon of his Sins, and a Fourth for Patience, and so on, in the same place, and at the same time, for all this might be done as well in a *silent Meeting*, where not a Word is spoken: But there being one Form of Praying for all to joyn together in, that with the united force of the whole Congregation, their Petitions may go up to Heaven. The Matter now in dispute is, Whether it be not necessary in order to this united Devotion, P. 62.

votion, that the people all know what they pray for? And one would think nothing need to be said to prove this: But what our Author adds in justification of this, overthrows all publick Devotion; For he saith, *It is not necessary to have attention on the Words, or on the Sense of Prayers, but rather purely on God:* Which is to make all publick Forms unnecessary, and to turn all Devotion into *Prayer of Contemplation*: For if this be true, all Forms whatsoever are not only useless, but burdensome; and by the stinting the Spirit, do hinder the nimbler flights of the Soul, in pure silence towards God: And this principle must lead men to *Enthusiasms*, and unintelligible Unions; and make them despise *Forms* as a mean and dull Dispensation.

But at last he saith, *A Petitioner may accompany his Petition with an earnest desire of obtaining it, tho the Language in which it is written, be unknown to him.* Very true, if he indited the matter of the Petition, and trusted another to put it into that Language, which the Person to whom he makes it, doth understand, but not his own: But all Languages are alike to Gods Infinite Wisdom, and so there can be no pretence on that account, to keep only to some particular Tongues, tho unknown to the Party; and if it were so to all men, no man would have a Petition presented in a Language which he did not know: But in prayer to God, the design of it is not to acquaint him with something which he knew not, but to excite the hearts and affections of men to an earnest desire of the things which are fit for them to ask: Now let any man undertake to prove, that mens affections are as easily moved by words they do not understand, as by those they do: and I will give up this Cause.

XXV. *Of the Second Commandment.*

THE Dispute about this is not, Whether the Second Commandment may be found in any of their Books, but by what Authority it comes to be left out in any: As he confesses it is *in their short Catechisms and Manuals*; but not only in these, for I have now before me the Reformed Office of the Blessed Virgin, Printed at *Salamanca*, *A. D.* 1588. published by Order of *Pius* V. where it is so left out; And so in the English Office at *Antwerp*, *A. D.* 1658. I wish he had told

P. 63.

told us in what publick Office of their Church it is to be found: but himſelf pleads for the leaving it out, when he ſaith, *The People are in no danger of Superſtition or Idolatry by it; ſince the Firſt Commandment ſecures them from it; and there is nothing in this, but what is vertually contained in the Firſt, and is rather an Explanation, than a new and diſtinct Precept.* But is this ſo plain and clear, that a Mans Conſcience can never make any juſt and reaſonable Doubt concerning it? There is a terrible ſanction after it; and men had need go upon very good Grounds in a matter of ſuch moment. Hath God himſelf any where declared this to be only an Explication of the firſt Commandment? Have the Prophets, or Chriſt and his Apoſtles ever done it? How then can any mans Conſcience be ſafe in this matter? For it is not a trifling Controverſie, whether it be a diſtinct Commandment, or an Explication of the Firſt; but the Lawfulneſs or Unlawfulneſs of the Worſhip of Images depends very much upon it: For if it be only an Explication of the Firſt, then unleſs *one takes Images to be Gods*, their Worſhip is lawful, and ſo the Heathens were excuſed in it, who were not ſuch Ideots: but if it be a new and diſtinct Precept, then the Worſhipping any Image or Similitude, becomes a grievous Sin, and expoſes men to the Wrath of God in that ſevere manner mentioned in the end of it: And it is a great confirmation that this is the true meaning of it, becauſe all the Primitive Writers of the Chriſtian Church, not only thought it a ſin againſt this Commandment, but inſiſted upon the force of it againſt thoſe Heathens who denied that they took their Images for Gods: And therefore this is a very inſufficient Account of leaving out the *Second Commandment*. P. 64.

XXVI. *Of Mental Reſervation.*

UNder this Head he denies Two Things.

1. *That they are ever taught to break Faith with Hereticks.*

2. *That their Church doth allow any Equivocations, or Mental Reſervations.*

As to the former I am ſincerely glad to find a Principle ſo deſtructive to all humane Society, ſo utterly diſowned, when he ſaith, *He is taught to keep Faith with all ſorts of People, of whatſoever* P. 64.

over judgment or perſwaſion they be; and to ſtand to his Word, and obſerve his Promiſe given, or made to any whatſoever. And whatever Opinions and Practices there may have been of that kind formerly, we hope there will never be occaſion given to revive that deſpute.

2. As to the Second, We embrace his Declaration againſt it, and hope there is no Equivocation, or Mental Reſervation in it. But there are ſome things which muſt here be taken notice of.

1. He cannot deny that there are Authors in Communion with his Church, which may be charged with teaching another Doctrine; and thoſe not a few, nor inconſiderable; who not only allow the Practice of Mental Reſervations and Equivocations, but ſay with great confidence, it hath been received in the *Roman* Church for no leſs than Four hundred years; and that in ſome Caſes they are ſtill agreed in it. See *Parſons* Treatiſe of *Mitigation, c. 7. Sect. 2. 3. c. 10. Sect. 1.*

2. We do not deny, that *Innocent* XI. hath condemned Equivocations, and Mental Reſervations in Swearing, as *at leaſt Scandalous and Pernicious in Practiſe*; and therefore we cannot charge the Pope with abetting this Doctrine. But we cannot but reflect on what our Author ſaid about the Depoſing Doctrine, *That although Popes had believed it, and acted by it, yet the greater number oppoſed it.* And what ſhall we ſay in this Caſe, if the Generality of their Caſuiſts in ſome Caſes approve it, and think it no *Lie or Perjury*, as in that of *Confeſſion*; but if it be really ſo in any one Caſe, then it may be ſome other fault; but it is not a *Lie or Perjury* in any other, when a Man doth not think himſelf bound to ſpeak all he knows.

3. That as we highly commend the Popes condemning ſuch Doctrines and Practiſes now; ſo we have Reaſon to think the contrary did not once want the encouragement and approbation of the *Roman See.* As may be found in the Reſolution of ſome Caſes by *Pius* V. relating to ſome *Miſſionaries*, who were to be ſent hither; and then it was declared, That if they were ſummon'd before our Judges, they might *Sophiſtice Jurare & Sophiſtice Reſpondere*; and that they were not bound to anſwer according to the Intention of the Judges, but according to ſome true ſenſe of their own, *i. e.* which was made true by the help of

Apud G. Abbot de Mendacio, &c. in Præf. p 6, &c.

of a Mental Reſervation. But it is very well, that now the very ſame things are condemned at *Rome*, as *ſcandalous and pernicious in practice.*

XVII. *Of a Death-Bed Repentance.*

WE have no difference with them about this matter, as far as they hold to theſe points: 1. *That men are ſtrictly obliged to work out their Salvation with fear and trembling in time of Health.* 2. *That it is very dangerous to defer their Repentance to the laſt.* 3. *That if any are ſurprized, they ought in charity to have all poſſible aſſiſtance, to put them into the beſt way for their Salvation.* P. 67, 68.

But yet there may be ſome particular Doctrines owned in the Church of *Rome*, which may give men too much encouragement to put off true Repentance; as 1. The eaſineſs of being put into a ſtate of Grace by the Sacrament of Penance; for which no more is required *than removing the impediment*; as appears by the Council of *Trent*, Seſſ. 7. Can. 6. and afterwards it defines *that bare Attrition doth ſufficiently diſpoſe a Man to receive Grace in that Sacrament*, Seſſ. 14. *c.* 4. So that altho a Man hath led a very bad Life, if he hath but this *Attrition* for his ſins when he doth confeſs them, he is put into a ſtate of Grace by this Sacrament. And what can any Man expect more, and what can he do leſs! I do not mean a bare *natural Attrition*, the ſufficiency whereof is condemned by *Innocent* XI. in the ſame Propoſitions (Fifty ſeventh) but that which the Council of *Trent* calls *imperfect contrition*, *i. e.* a good Motion in a Mans mind to forſake his ſins for fear of puniſhment; if really no more be required for a ſtate of Grace but this, it is no wonder if men put off the doing of that which may be done at any time ſo eaſily by the help of a Prieſt.

2. The Treaſure of the Church is another thing which is very apt to hinder Mens ſpeedy Repentance; for by that they believe there is a ſtock ready of ſo many Merits and Satisfactions of others, if duely applied to them by Indulgences, that they need not be at ſuch pains to *work out their own ſalvation with fear and trembling*. When a Man by the Sacrament of Penance is put into

into a ſtate of Grace, the Eternal Puniſhment is diſcharged, and nothing remains but ſome Temporal pains: and to eaſe him of theſe he hath many helps, but eſpecially the Treaſure of the Church, which the Pope hath the diſpenſing of, as he is bound to believe: and by Indulgences he may eaſily get off ſome Thouſands of Years of Purgatory Pains; and if theſe ſhould fail him, there is another help yet left, which is leaving a ſtock for Prayers for his Soul when he dies: *which*, even our Author aſſures him, *are very available towards his ſpeedier releaſe out of Purgatory*, p. 58.

XXVIII. *Of FASTING.*

THE Queſtion here is, Whether a Man doth not obſerve their Churches Command about Faſting who forbears all forbidden things, but takes liberty in thoſe which are not forbidden?

It is not, Whether they may not break the Commands of God, againſt *Gluttony* and *Drunkenneſs*: But whether they break the Law of the Church about Faſting? And notwithſtanding what our Author hath ſaid, I ſee no Reaſon for the Affirmative. I do not deny, 1. That it is a very indifferent ſort
P. 69. of Faſting, *to abſtain from Fleſh, unleſs all other ſorts of Exceſſes at the ſame time be carefully avoided.* 2. *That exceſſes on ſuch days are more ſcandalous, becauſe there is a pretence of Faſting.* 3. *That*
P. 71. *God's Command doth at all times forbid Intemperance.* Which are the chief things he inſiſts upon. But yet this doth not reach the point, which is about their *Churches Command*. For their Caſuiſts diſtinguiſh Faſting into 1. *Natural*: which is total Abſtinence: and this is required only in order to receive the Euchariſt. 2. *Moral*: which is the ſame with Temperance, or Faſting for Health. 3. *Eccleſiaſtical*: which is defined by them to be, *An Abſtinence from Food forbidden by the Church.* And if this Definition be true, it cannot be broken but by eating what the Church hath prohibited.

And therefore their Caſuiſts, as far as I can find, are agreed in theſe things,

1. That

1. That a Man may eat a full Meal of what is not forbidden, and not break the Churches Precept of Fasting, provided Vespers be first said. And the later Casuists blame *Covarruvias* for making any scruple about it. *If a Mans Excess comes to be a Mortal sin; yet for all that,* saith *Reginaldus, He shall not be judged as a breaker of his Fast.* Nay, *Lessius* goes further, and saith, *He doth not lose the Merit of Fasting. Quamvis aliquis multum excedat non solvit Jejunium,* saith *Card. Tolet.* And *Paulus Zacchias* saith, *This is the common Opinion*; and he thinks the *Intention* of the *Church is sufficiently answered.* And so doth *Pasqualigus* in his *Praxis* of Fasting.

Reginald. Praxis l. 4. c. l. 4. n. 163. Leff. de Justit. l. 4. c. 2. Dub. 2. n. 10. Instruct. Sacred. l. 6. c. 2. n. 4. P. Zacch. Qu. Medico. legales l. 5. tit. 1. Qu. 1. p. 29, 30, 13. Pasqual. Decis. 120. n. 5. Dian. Sam. v. Jejun. n. 7. Zach. Pasqualigi. Praxis Jejunii Eccles. Decis. 116. n. 3. Dec. 117. 1, 2, 3.

2. A Man may drink Wine, or other drink, as often as he pleaseth, without breaking his Fast. He may *toties quoties bibere,* saith *Diana. Zach. Pasqualigus,* who hath Written most fully on this Subject, shews, *That it is the general Opinion, that no quantity of Wine or other drink, tho taken without any Necessity, is a violation of the Precept of Fasting*; *no, not although the Wine be taken for nourishment, because the Church doth not forbid it*; *but this last,* he saith, *is not the general, but the more probable Opinion.*

3. A Man may eat something when he drinks, to prevent its doing him hurt; besides his good Meal, he may take what quantity he pleases of Sweet-meats or Fruit; he may have a good Refection at Night, and yet not break this strict Precept of Fasting; *For the eating as often as one drinks, it is the common Opinion,* saith the same Casuist (who was no *Jesuit*) *That it is not forbidden, because it is taken by way of a Medicine*; and he quotes a great number of their *Casuists* for it. *A Collation at evening is allowed,* saith he. And *Lessius* saith, *There is no certain Rule for the Quantity of it.* And *Card. Tolet* saith, *very large ones are allowed at* Rome *by the Popes Connivence*; *even in the Court of* Rome, saith *Reginaldus.* And now I leave the Reader to judge of the severity of Fasting required in the Church of *Rome.*

Decis. 119. n. 2. Decis. 86. n. 34. Less. ubi. supr. n. 11. Tolet. ubi sub. Regin ubi sup. n. 185.

XXIX. *Of Divisions and Schisms in the Church.*

TWO things he saith upon this Head.

1. *That they are all agreed in matters of Faith.*

2. *That they only differ in some School Points*; from whence he infers, That they have no Schisms or Separations among them.

But that this is no just consequence, will appear by the Schisms and Separations among us, made by such who profess to agree in all matters of Faith. Yet let us see how he proves that they agree in all matters of Faith; *because they agree to submit equally to the Determinations of the Church.* Pag. 72.

Now this very way evidently proves that they do not all agree, because they do not equally submit to the Churches determinations. For,

1. Some say they are bound to submit to the Churches Determinations, as it represents the Universal Church; Others say no: but as the Churches Power is virtually lodged in the Guides of it. Now this is a very material Difference: For if it be on the former Account, then not the Popes and Councils Declarations are to be regarded, but as they express the sense of the Universal Church; and so the Majority of Votes, and Numbers in the Representative and Diffusive Church is chiefly to be regarded. And on this Ground some reject the Deposing Power, tho plainly decreed by Popes and Councils: but they unhinge their Churches Authority by it. Now how is it possible for them to agree about matters of Faith, who differ fundamentally about the way how any things come to be matters of Faith? If they be decreed by Popes and Councils, say some; and so the Deposing Power is become an Article of Faith. No such matter, say others, for a greater Number in the diffusive Church oppose it, as in the *Gallican* Church, and elsewhere. Very well! But how then can these Parties be said to agree in matters of Faith, and an equal Submission to the Determinations of the Church?

2. Some again say, That it is not the consent of the present Church can make any Article of Faith, but there must be an Universal

Universal Tradition from the Apostles times. And so they tell us the Deposing Power can never be an Article of Faith, because it wants the Consent of all the Ages before *Gregory* VII. So that upon this Ground there can be no Article of Faith which cannot be proved to be thus delivered down to us. Others again say, this is in effect to give up their Cause, knowing the impossibility of proving particular Points in this manner: and therefore they say, the present Church is wholly to be trusted for the sense of the foregoing.

Now these differences are still on Foot in their Church; and from these do arise daily disputes about Matters of Faith, and the Seat of Infallibility, whether in the Guides, or the body of the Church: if the former, whether in the Church Representative, or Virtual? whether the Personal Infallibility of the Pope be a matter of Faith or not? Our Author saith, Not; others say yes: and yet he saith, *they are agreed in matters of Faith*: So that by his own Confession they differ about other things than mere School-points.

But suppose they were *agreed in Articles of Faith*, can there be no Schisms or Divisions in their Church? What thinks he of all the Schisms between Popes and Popes? Of all the Schisms between the Popes and the Emperors Parties? Which were as notorious, and scandalous, and mischievous, as ever were in the World. What thinks he of the Schisms between the Bishops and the Regular Orders, which were as cross and peevish towards the Bishops and Secular Clergy, as our Dissenters themselves? And among the Regular Orders, what Heats and Contentions have been, *Not about the Practice of a devout Life*, I assure him, but about matters of Doctrine: and which both Parties severally plead to be matters of Faith? As in the noted Controversies of this last Age, about the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the power of Grace, and the Popes Personal Infallibility: and they cannot say they are as yet agreed about these things.

XXX. *Of Friars and Nuns.*

OUR Dispute is not, About the lawfulness of retiring from the World by such Persons who are rendred unfit for doing Service in it; and the more they spend their time in Devotion and Contemplation, so much the better.

But it lies in these Things,

1. Whether the Perfection of a Christian State of Life lies in being cloystered up from the World, or labouring to do good in it? For this was the great snare made use of, to draw men into it, because they represented this as the most perfect state; whereas according to the Doctrine and Example of Christ and his Apostles, the active Life of doing good, is far beyond it.

2. Whether, altho such a retirement be allowed, it be a thing pleasing to God, to tye such Persons up by indispensable Vows, whatever their Circumstances may be, not to alter that State of Life; who either in Youth, or through Force, Passion, or Discontent, have entred into it? And this may be so much rather questioned, because those who assert the Pope may dispense, go upon this Ground, Because Circumstances may alter the Obligation of a Vow; and when a greater good is to be attained, it ceaseth to oblige; which to my apprehension doth not prove the Popes power to dispense, but the dispensible Nature of the Vows themselves.

3. Whether all things of this nature being liable in continuance of time, to great Degeneracy and Corruptions; and the numbers of such Places being unserviceable either to Church or State, it be not in the power of the King and States of the Kingdom, to dissolve and reduce them to ways more suitable to the Conveniences of both?

As to what he discourses about *Councils of Perfection, the Distractions of the World, the Corruptions of the best Things*, &c. They reach not the main points, but are only general Topicks, which we are not concerned to debate.

XXXI. *Of*

XXXI. *Of Wicked Principles and Practices.*

THE *Misrepresenter* charges the Church of *Rome* with many horrid Practices, as the *French* and *Irish* Massacres, the Murders of Two Kings of *France*, the Holy League, the Gun-powder-Treason, &c. And charges these as being done according to the Principles of that Church.

But in answer to this he saith, 1. In General, *That the Doctrine of it is holy, teaching the Love of God and our neighbour, and that none can be saved by Faith alone.* In which Doctrine we heartily concur with them. Pag. 77. 2. *That altho many uncertain things pass for certain, and false for true, yet he cannot deny that all ranks and degrees of men have been corrupted among them, being scandalous in their Lives, wicked in their designs, without the Fear of God in their hearts, or care of their own Salvation.* This is a general acknowledgment, but no particular Answer to the things objected. Pag. 79. 3. *That the whole Church is not to be charged for the sake of such villanies.* Very true, unless some Doctrine owned in that Church gave encouragement to them: As suppose any should ever have fallen into Rebellion upon the belief of the Deposing Power; is not that Doctrine chargeable with the Consequences of it? They are extremely to blame who charge a Church with what her Members do in direct Opposition to her Doctrine; but it is quite another Case, when the main Ground we alledge for their Actions is some allowed Principle in it. Pag. 81. 4. *They are not accountable for the Actions of every Bishop, Cardinal, or Pope; for they extend not their Faith beyond the Declaration of General Councils.* But suppose General Councils have declared such Doctrines, and Popes act but according to them; is not their Church then accountable for their Actions? Pag. 82. 5. *There is more Praying and Fasting, and receiving the Sacraments, more visiting the Prisoners, and the Sick, more Alms-giving in any of our neighbouring Popish Towns, as* Paris, Antwerp, Gant, *&c. than in any Ten Towns of the Reformation.* And is there more *Charity* too? It doth not appear, if they be as ready to censure others, and admire themselves, as our Author, who so freely gives his Judgment about a matter it is impossible for him to know. Pag. 83.

We

We see no Reason to admire or imitate the manner of their Praying, and Fasting, and receiving the Sacraments? for *to pray without Understanding*, to *fast without Abstinence*, to *receive a maimed Sacrament*, are things we do not envy them for; but altho our Devotion be not so pompous, and full of shew, yet We may pray and fast in secret, according to our Saviours Directions, far more than they do; however our People are mightily to blame if they do not understand what they pray for if they do not receive more of the Sacrament than they; and we verily believe there are as great and remarkable Instances of *true Charity* among those of the Church of *England*, as among any People in the World.

XXXII. *Of MIRACLES.*

Pag. 83. 1. OUR Author saith, *He is not obliged to believe any one Miracle besides what is in Scripture.*

2. He sees no Reason *to doubt the truth of many Miracles, which are attested by great numbers of Eye-witnesses, examined by Authority, and found upon Record, with all the Formalities due to such a Process.*

Now, how can these two things stand together? Is not a Man obliged to believe a thing so well proved? And if his other Arguments prove any thing, it is, that he is bound to believe them. For he thinks there is as much Reason to believe Miracles still, as in the time of the old or new Law. If he can make this out, I see no reason why he should not be as well obliged to believe them now, as those recorded in Scripture. But I can see nothing like a Proof of this. And all Persons of Judgment in their own Church, do grant there is a great difference between the Necessity of Miracles for the first establishing a Religion, and afterwards. This is not only asserted by *Tostatus*, *Erasmus*, *Stella*, *Andradius*, and several others formerly; but the very late *French* Author I have several times mentioned, saith it in expres Terms. And he confesses the great Impostures of modern Miracles, which, he saith, ought to be severely punished; and that none but Women and weak People think themselves bound to believe them. And he cannot understand what they

Moyens Surs & Honestes: &c. To. 2. p. 149.

they are good for: Not to convert Hereticks; becauſe not done among them: Not to prove there are no corruptions or errors among them, which is a thing incredible; with much more to that purpoſe; and ſo concludes with *Monſieur Paſchal, That if they have no better uſe, we ought not to be amuſed with them.*

But Chriſt promiſed, that his Apoſtles ſhould do greater Miracles than himſelf had done. And what then? Muſt therefore S. *Francis*, or S. *Dominic*, or S. *Roſa*, do as great as the Apoſtles had done? What conſequence can be drawn from the Apoſtles times to latter Ages? We do not diſpute *God's Omnipotency, or ſay his hand is ſhortned*; but we muſt not from thence infer, that every thing which is called a Miracle is truly ſo; or to make uſe of God's Power, to juſtifie the moſt incredible ſtories. Which is a way will ſerve as well for a falſe as a true Religion; and *Mahomet* might run to Gods Omnipotency for cleaving the Moon in two pieces, as well as others for removing a Houſe over the Seas, or any thing of a like nature.

But, he ſaith, *their Miracles are not more ridiculous and abſurd than ſome in the Old Teſtament.* Which I utterly deny; but I ſhall not run out into the examination of this Parallel, by ſhewing how very different the Nature, Deſign, and Authority of the Miracles he mentions, is from thoſe which are believed in the *Roman* Church. And it had been but fitting, as he ſet down the Miracles of the *Old Teſtament*, ſo to have mentioned thoſe of the *Roman* Church which were to vye with them; but this he was willing to forbear, for certain good Reaſons. *If moſt of poor Man's impoſſibles be none to God*, as he concludes, yet every thing is not preſently true which is not impoſſible; and by this way of Arguing, there can be nothing objected againſt the moſt abſurd and idle Fictions of the Golden Legend, which all Men of Underſtanding among themſelves, not only reject for want of Authority, but of Credibility.

XXXIII. *Of Holy Water.*

THE *Misrepresenter* charges him with *approving superstitious* uses of inanimate things, and attributing wonderfull effects to them; as Holy Water, Candles, Oyl, Bread, *&c.*

In Answer, our Author 1. declares, *That the Papist* truly represented, *utterly disapproves all sorts of Superstition.* But if he had designed to have represented truly, he ought to have told us what he meant by Superstition, and whether any Man who observes the Commands of the Church can be guilty of it.

Pag. 86.

2. He saith, *That these things are particularly deputed by the Prayers and Blessing of the Priest to certain uses for God's Glory, and the Spiritual and Corporal Good of Christians.*

This is somewhat too general; but *Marsilius Columna*, Archbishop of *Salerno*, who hath taken most pains in this matter, sums them up; 1. *As to Spiritual, they are Seven.* 1. *To fright Devils.* 2. *To remit Venial sins.* 3. *To cure Distractions.* 4. *To elevate the Mind.* 5. *To dispose it for Devotion.* 6. *To obtain Grace.* 7. *To prepare for the Sacrament.*

Hydragiolog. Sect. 3. c. 2. 12. p. 45.

2. *As to Corporal.* 1. *To cure Barrenness.* 2. *To multiply Goods.* 3. *To procure Health.* 4. *To purge the Air from pestilential Vapours.*

And now, as our Author saith, *What Superstition in the use of it?* He names several things of Gods own apponting to Parallel it? as *the Waters of Jealousie, the Shew-bread, the Tables of Stone*; but the first was miraculous, the other had no such effects that we ever heard of. *Elisha's Salt for sweetning the Water*, was undoubtedly a Miracle. Is the *Holy Water* so? As to the *Liver of the Fish for expelling the Devil*, in the Book of *Tobit*, he knows the Book is not owned for Canonical by us; and this very place is produced as an Argument against it; there being no Ground from Scripture, to attribut the Power of expelling Devils, to the Liver of a Fish, either naturally or symbolically: *Vallesius* offers at the only probable account of it, that it must be a Divine Power given to it, which the Angel *Raphael* did not discover; and yet it is somewhat hard to conceive, how this Liver

Valles. Sacr. Philosoph. c. 18. p. 229.

should

ſhould have ſuch a power to drive away any kind of Devil, as it is there expreſſed, unleſs by a Devil there, no more be meant than ſome violent Diſeaſe, which the *Jews* generally believed to ariſe from the poſſeſſion of evil Spirits: But however here is an Angel ſuppoſed, who made this known to *Tobit*; but we find not *Raphael* to diſcover the virtue of Holy Water againſt Devils. As to *Chriſt uſing Clay to open the Eyes of the Blind*, it is very improperly applied, unleſs the ſame miraculous Power be ſuppoſed in it, which was in Chriſt himſelf: And ſo is the *Apoſtles laying on of Hands, and uſing Oyl for miraculous Cures*; unleſs the ſame Gift of Miracles be in every Prieſt which conſecrates Holy Water, which was in the Apoſtles: And *Bellarmine* himſelf confeſſes, *That no infallible effect doth follow the uſe of Holy Water, becauſe there is no Promiſe of God in the caſe, but only the prayers of the Church. But theſe are ſufficient to ſanctifie the Water*, ſaith our Author: And to what end? For all the ſpiritual and corporeal benefits before mentioned? Is no promiſe of God neceſſary for ſuch purpoſes as thoſe? How can any Church in the World diſpoſe of Gods Power without his Will? It may appoint ſignificant and decent Ceremonies, but it can never appropriate Divine Effects to them; and to ſuppoſe any Divine Power in things which God never gave them, is in my Opinion, Superſtitious; and to uſe them for ſuch ends, is a ſuperſtitious uſe. St. *Cyril*, whom he quotes, ſpeaks of the Conſecration of the Water of Baptiſm, *Catech.* 3. St. *Auguſtine* only of a conſecrated Bread, which the *Catechumens* had (*De Peccat. Merit. & Remiſſ.* l. 2. c. 26.) but he attributes no Divine Effects to it. Pope *Alexanders Epiſtle* is a notorious Counterfeit. Thoſe Paſſages of *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, and S. *Jerom*, all ſpeak of miraculous effects; and thoſe who had the power of Miracles, might ſometimes do them with an external ſign, and ſometimes without, as the Apoſtles cured with anointing, and without: But this is no ground for conſecrating Oyl by the Church, or Holy VVater, for miraculous Effects. If theſe Effects which they attribute to *Holy Water*, be miraculous, then every Prieſt muſt have not only a power of Miracles himſelf, but of annexing it to the VVater he conſecrates; if they be ſuper-natural, but not miraculous, then Holy VVater muſt be made a Sacrament to produce theſe Effects *ex opere operato*; if neither one nor the other, I know not how to excuſe the uſe of it from *Superſtition*.

De Cultu Sanct. *l.* 3. *c.* 7.

XXXIV. *Of breeding up People in Ignorance.*

THE *Misrepreſenter* charges them with this, on theſe Accounts. 1. By keeping their Myſteries of Iniquity from them. 2. By performing Divine Service in an unknown Tongue. 3. By an implicite Faith. To which the *Repreſenter* anſwers, P. 89. 1. *That they give encouragement to Learning*; and he inſtances *in their Univerſities and Conventual Libraries*; But what is all this to the common People? But their *Indices Expurgatorii, and prohibiting Books ſo ſeverely*, which are not for their turn, (as we have lately ſeen in the new one of *Paris*) argues no great confidence of their Cauſe, nor any hearty love to Learning: And if it could be rooted out of the World, their Church would fare the better in it; but if it cannot, they muſt have ſome to be able to deal with others in it. P. 90. 2. As to the common People he ſaith, *They have Books enough to inſtruct them.* Is it ſo in *Spain* or *Italy*? But where they live among Hereticks, as we are called, the People muſt be a little better inſtructed to defend themſelves, and to gain upon others. 3. *If the People did know their Church-Offices and Service*, &c. *they would not find ſuch faults, ſince the Learned approve them.* Let them then try the Experiment, and put the Bible and their Church-Offices every where into the Vulgar Tongues: But their ſevere Prohibitions ſhew how much they are of another Opinion: What made all that Rage in *France* againſt *Voiſins* Tranſlation of the *Miſſal*? Such Proceedings of the Aſſembly of the Clergy againſt it; ſuch complaints both to the King and the Pope againſt it, as tho all were loſt, if that were ſuffered? Such an Edict from the King, ſuch a Prohibition from the Pope in ſuch a Tragical Stile about it? Such a Collection of Authors to be printed on purpoſe againſt it? Do theſe things ſhew, even in a Nation of ſo free a Temper, in Compariſon, as the *French*, any mighty Inclination towards the encouraging this Knowledg in the People? And ſince that, what ſtirs have there been about the *Mons* Teſtament? What Prohibitions by Biſhops? beſides a Bull from this very Pope againſt it. What vehement Oppoſition by others? So that many Volumes have already been written on the occaſion of that Tranſlation. And yet our Author would perſwade

Collectio Authorum Vulg. Verſionis damnantium Juſſu. ac Mandato Cleri Gallicani edita. Luter. Paris. 1661.

perſwade us, *That if we look abroad, we ſhall find wonderful care taken to keep the People from Ignorance*; but we can diſcern much greater to keep them in it.

XXXV. *Of the Uncharitableneſs of the Papiſts.*

THE *Miſrepreſenter*, (as he is called) charges this Point home, *Becauſe they deny Salvation to thoſe who believe all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith in the Apoſtles Creed, and lead vertuous and good Lives, if they be not of their Communion.*

To this the *Repreſenter* anſwers in plain terms, *That this is nothing but what they have learnt from the mouth of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.* And to this end he muſters up all their ſayings againſt Infidels, falſe Apoſtles, *Gnoſticks*, *Cerinthians*, as tho they were point-blank levelled againſt all that live out of the Communion of the Church of *Rome.* P. 92.

But *this is no Uncharitableneſs, but pure zeal, and the ſame the Primitive Church ſhewed againſt Hereticks, ſuch as* Marcion, Baſilides, *and* Bardeſanes, *who were condemned in the firſt Age for denying the Reſurrection of the dead*, &c. What in the firſt Age! Methinks the Second had been early enough for them: But this is to let us ſee what Learning there is among you. But do we deny the Reſurrection of the Dead? Or hold any one of the Hereſies condemned by the Primitive Church? What then is our Fault, which can merit ſo ſevere a Sentence? *We oppoſe the Church:* What Church? The Primitive Apoſtolical Church? The Church in the time of the four General Councils? I do not think that will be ſaid; but I am ſure it can never be proved: What Church then? *The preſent Church*? Is it then damnable to oppoſe the preſent Church? But I pray let us know what you mean by it; *The Univerſal Body of Chriſtians in the World*? No, No, abundance of them are *Hereticks and Schiſmaticks*, as well as we: *i. e.* All the Chriſtians in the *Eaſtern* and *Southern* parts, who are not in Communion with the Church of *Rome:* So that two parts in three of Chriſtians, are ſent to Hell by this Principle; and yet it is no Uncharitableneſs. But ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome* be *the only true Church*, muſt men be damned P. 95.

preſently for oppoſing its Doctrines? I pray think a little better on it, and you will change your Minds. Suppoſe a Man do not ſubmit to the Guides of this Church in a matter of Doctrine declared by them; Muſt he be Damned? What if it be the Depoſing Power? Yet his Principle is, *If a Man do not hold the*
Pag. 96. *Faith entire, he is gone.* But Popes and Councils have declared this to be a point of Faith; therefore if he doth not hold it, he muſt be damned. There is no way of anſwering this, but he muſt abate the ſeverity of his Sentence againſt us. For upon the ſame Reaſon he queſtions that, we may queſtion many more. And all his Arguments againſt us, will hold againſt himſelf; *For,*
Pag. 97. ſaith he, *he that disbelieves one Article of Catholick Faith, does in a manner disbelieve all.* Let him therefore look to it, as well
Pag. 98. as we. But he endeavours to prove *the Roman Catholick Church to be the true Church, by the ordinary Notes and Marks of the Church.* Although he is far enough from doing it; yet this will not do his buſineſs. For he muſt prove, that we are convinced that it is the true Church; and then indeed he may charge us with *Obſtinate Oppoſition*, but not before. And it is a very ſtrange thing to me, that when their Divines ſay, that Infidels ſhall not be damned for their Infidelity, where the Goſpel hath not been ſufficiently propoſed to them; and no Chriſtian for not believing any Article of Faith till it be ſo propoſed; that we muſt be damned for not believing the Articles of the *Roman* Faith, which never have been, and never can be ſufficiently propoſed to us. Methinks ſuch men ſhould Study a little better their own Doctrine about the ſufficient Propoſal of matters of Faith, before they paſs ſuch uncharitable and unlearned Cenſures.

XXXVI. *Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.*

HIS Diſcourſe on this Head is againſt thoſe who refuſe to obey their Superiours in things not expreſſed in Scripture, which is no part of our Controverſy with them. But yet there are ſeveral things about their Ceremonies we are not ſatisfied in: As 1. The mighty Number of them, which have ſo much muffled up the Sacraments, that their true face cannot be diſcerned. 2. The Efficacy attributed to them, without any promiſe from

from God; whereas we own no more but decency and ſignificancy. 3. The Doctrine that goes along with them, not only of Obedience, but of Merit, and ſome have aſſerted the *Opus Operatum* of Ceremonies as well as Sacraments, when the Power of the Keys goes along with them; *i. e.* when there hath been ſome Act of the Church exerciſed about the Matter of them, as in the Conſecration of Oyl, Salt, Bread, Aſhes, Water, *&c.*

XXXVII. *Of Innovations in matters of Faith.*

THE Subſtance of his Diſcourſe on this Head may be reduced to theſe things. 1. *That the Church in every Age hath Power to declare what is neceſſary to be believed, with Anathema to thoſe who Preach the Contrary; and ſo the Council of* Trent, *in declaring Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory,* &c. *to be neceſſary Articles, did no more than the Church had done before on like Occaſions.* P. 108, 109.
2. *That if the Doctrines then defined had been Innovations, they muſt have met with great Oppoſition when they were introduced.* P. 112, *&c.*
3. *That thoſe who charged thoſe points to be Innovations, might as well have laid the ſcandal on any other Article of Faith which they retained.* P. 116.

Theſe are things neceſſary to be examined, in order to the making good the charge of Innovation in matters of Faith, which we believe doth ſtand on very good grounds.

1. We are to conſider, Whether the Council of *Trent* had equal Reaſon to define the neceſſity of theſe points, as the Council of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople* had to determin the point of the Trinity; or thoſe of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, the Truth of Chriſt's Incarnation. He doth not aſſert it to be in the Churches Power to make new Articles of Faith, as they do imply new Doctrines revealed; but he contends earneſtly, that the Church hath a Power to declare the neceſſity of believing ſome points which were not ſo declared before. And if the Neceſſity of believing doth depend upon the Churches Declaration, then he muſt aſſert, that it is in the Churches Power to make points neceſſary to be believed which were not ſo; and conſequently to make common Opinions to become Articles of Faith. But I hope we may have leave to enquire in this Caſe, ſince the Church pretends to no new Revelation of matters of Doctrine, therefore it can declare no more than P. 109.

than it receives, and no otherwiſe than it receives. And ſo nothing can be made neceſſary to Salvation but what God himſelf hath made ſo by his Revelation. So that they muſt go in their Declaration either upon Scripture, or Univerſal Tradition; but if they define any Doctrine to be neceſſary without theſe Grounds, they exceed their Commiſſion, and there is no Reaſon to ſubmit to their Decrees, or to believe their Declarations. To make this more plain by a known Inſtance: It is moſt certain, that ſeveral Popes and Councils have declared the Depoſing Doctrine, and yet our Author ſaith, *It is no Article of Faith with him.* Why not, ſince the Popes and Councils have as evidently delivered it, as the Council of *Trent* hath done Purgatory, or Tranſubſtantiation? But he may ſay, *There is no Anathema joyned to it.* Suppoſe there be not; But why may it not be, as well as in the other Caſes? And if it were, I would know, whether in his Conſcience he would then believe it to be a neceſſary Article of Faith, tho he believed that it wanted Scripture and Tradition? If not, then he ſees what this matter is brought to, *viz.* That altho the Council of *Trent* declare theſe new Doctrines to be neceſſary to be believed; yet if their Declaration be not built on Scripture and Univerſal Tradition, we are not bound to receive it.

2. *As to the impoſſibility of Innovations coming in without notorious oppoſition,* I ſee no ground at all for it, where the alteration is not made at once, but proceeds gradually. He may as well prove it impoſſible for a Man to fall into a *Dropſie* or a *Hectick Fever,* unleſs he can tell the punctual time when it began. And he may as well argue thus, Such a Man fell into a Fever upon a great Debauch, and the Phyſicians were preſently ſent for to adviſe about him; therefore the other Man hath no Chronical Diſtemper, becauſe he had no Phyſicians when he was firſt ſick; as becauſe Councils were called againſt ſome Hereſies, and great Oppoſition made to them, therefore where there is not the like, there can be no *Innovation.* But I ſee no Reaſon why we ſhould decline giving an Account, by what Degrees, and Steps, and upon what Occaſions, and with what Oppoſition ſeveral of the Doctrines defined at *Trent* were brought in. For the matter is not ſo obſcure as you would make it, as to moſt of the Points in difference between us. But that is too large a Task to be here undertaken.

3. There

3. There is no Colour for calling in Queſtion the Articles of Faith received by us on the ſame Grounds that we reject thoſe defined by the Council of *Trent*; for we have the Univerſal Conſent of the Chriſtian World for the Apoſtles Creed; and of the Four General Councils for the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; who never pretended to determine any Point to be neceſſary which was not revealed in Scripture; whoſe ſenſe was delivered down by the Teſtimony of the Chriſtian Church from the Apoſtles times. But the Council of *Trent* proceeded by a very different Rule; for it firſt ſet up *an Unwritten Word* to be a Rule of Faith, as well as the *Written*; which altho it were neceſſary in order to their Decrees, was one of the greateſt Innovations in the World; and the Foundation of all the reſt, as they were there eſtabliſhed. Seſſ. Quarta.

An Anſwer to the *CONCLUSION.*

HAving thus gone through the ſeveral Heads, which our Author complains have been ſo much *Miſrepreſented*; it is now fit to conſider what he ſaith in his *Concluſion*, which he makes to anſwer his *Introduction*, by renewing therein his doleful Complaints of their being *Miſrepreſented juſt as Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and the Primitive Chriſtians were.* I hope the former Diſcourſe hath ſhewed their Doctrines and Practices are not ſo very like thoſe of *Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and the Primitive Chriſtians*, that their Caſes ſhould be made ſo parallel: but as in his Concluſion he hath ſummed up the ſubſtance of his *Repreſentations*, ſo ſhall I therein follow his Method, only with this difference, that I ſhall in one Column ſet down his own *Repreſentations* of Popery, and in the other the Reaſons, in ſhort, why we cannot embrace them. P. 119.

Wherein Popery conſiſts as Repreſented by this Author.	*Our Reaſons againſt it in the ſeveral Particulars.*
1. IN uſing all external Acts of Adoration before Images, as *Kneeling, Praying, lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incenſe*, &c. Not merely to worſhip the Objects before them, but to worſhip the Images themſelves on the account of the Ob-	*THou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image, or any likeneſs of any thing in Heaven, or Earth*, &c. *Thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor Worſhip them.* Which being the plain, clear, and expreſs Words of the Divine Law, we dare not worſhip any

jects represented by them: or in his own Words, *Because the Honour that is exhibited to them, is referred to the Prototypes which they represent.* p. 3.

any Images, or Representations, lest we be found Transgressors of this Law. Especially since God herein hath declared himself a *Jealous God*; and annexed so severe a Sanction to it. And since he that made the Law is only to interpret it, all the Distinctions in the World can never satisfie a Mans Conscience, unless it appear that God himself did either make or approve them. And if God allow the Worship of the thing Represented by the Representation, he would never have forbidden that Worship absolutely, which is unlawful only in a certain respect.

2. *In joyning the Saints in Heaven together with Christ in Intercession for us, and making Prayers on Earth to them on that Account.* p. 5.

2. *We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,* 1 John. 2. 1. *And one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus,* 1 Tim. 2. 5. *For Christ is entred into Heaven it self, now to appear in the Presence of God for us,* Heb. 9. 24. And therefore we dare not make other *Intercessors in Heaven* besides him: and the distance between Heaven and us, breaks off all Communication between the Saints there, and us upon Earth; so that all Addresses to them now for their Prayers, are in a way very different from desiring others on earth to pray for us: And if such Addresses are made in the solemn Offices of Divine Worship, they joyn the Creatures with the Creator in the Acts and Signs of Worship, which are due to God alone.

3. *Call*

Popery as Repreſented.

3. *In allowing more Supplications to be uſed to the Bleſſed Virgin, than to Chriſt*; For he denies it to be *an idle Superſtition*, to repeat *Ten Ave Maria's* for one *Pater Noſter*.

4. *In giving Religious Honour and Reſpect to Relicks.* Such as placing them upon Altars, burning Wax-Candles before them, carrying them in Proceſſions, to be ſeen, touched, or humbly kiſſed by the People: Which are the known and allowed Practices in the Church of *Rome*. P. 8.

Our Reaſons againſt it.

3. *Call upon me in the Day of Trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou ſhalt glorifie me*, Pſal. 50. 15. When we pray to *Our Father in Heaven*, as our Saviour commanded us, we do but what both Natural and Chriſtian Religion require us to do: But when men pray to the Bleſſed Virgin for *Help and Protection now, and at the Hour of Death*, they attribute that to her, which belongs only to God, who is our *Helper and Defender*: And altho Chriſt knew *the Dignity of his Mother* above all others, he never gives the leaſt encouragement to make ſuch Addreſſes to her: And to ſuppoſe her to have a ſhare now in the Kingdom of Chriſt in Heaven, as a Copartner with him, is to advance a Creature to Divine Honour, and to overthrow the true Ground of Chriſts Exaltation to his Kingdom in Heaven, which was, His ſuffering on the Croſs for us.

4. *And no man knoweth of the Sepulcher of Moſes unto this day*, Deut. 34. 6. Why ſhould God hide the Body of *Moſes* from the People, if he allowed *giving Religious Honour and Reſpect to Relicks?* Why ſhould *Hezekiah break in Pieces the Brazen Serpent, becauſe the Children of Iſrael did burn Incenſe to it?* 2 Kings 18. 4. Eſpecially when it was a Type or Repreſentation of Chriſt himſelf, and God had wrought many Miracles by it.

Popery as Represented.	*Our Reasons against it.*
5. *In adoring Christ as present in the Eucharist on the account of the Substance of Bread and VVine being changed into that Body of Christ which suffered on the Cross.* P. 10.	5. *VVhom the Heaven must receive until the times of the Restitution of all things*, Acts 3. 21. And therefore in the Eucharist we adore him, as *sitting on the right hand of God*; but we dare not direct our Adoration to the Consecrated Host, which we believe to be the Substance of Bread and VVine, (tho consecrated to a Divine Mystery), and therefore not a fit Object for our Adoration.
6. *In believing the Substance of Bread and VVine by the VVords of Consecration, to be changed into his own Body and Blood, the Species only or Accidents of Bread and VVine remaining as before.* P. 10.	6. *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* 1 Cor. 10. 16. This is spoken of the *Bread* after Consecration, and yet the Apostle supposes it to be Bread still, and the *Communion of his Body* is interpreted by the next words, *For we being many, are one Bread, and one Body; for we are all Partakers of that one Bread*, v. 17. VVhich is very different from the Bread being changed into the very Body of Christ; which is an Opinion that hath no Foundation in Scripture, and is repugnant to the common Principles of Reason, which God hath given us, and exposes Christian Religion to the Reproach and Contempt of *Jews, Turks, and Infidels.*
7. *In making good VVorks to be truly meritorious of Eternal Life.* P. 13.	7. *VVhen ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, VVe are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do*, St. Luke 17. 10. And therefore in no sense can our best Works be *truly Meritorious of Eternal Life*: Which consisting

Popery as Represented.

Our Reasons against it.

sisting in the enjoyment of God, it is impossible there should be any just Proportion, or due Commensuration between our best Actions, and such a Reward.

8. *In making Confession of our sins to a Priest in order to Absolution.* P. 14.

8. *And the Son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against Heaven, and in thy sight,* St. Luke 15. 21.

Where Confession to God is required because the Offence is against him, but it is impossible for any Man upon earth to forgive those whom God doth not forgive: And he alone can appoint the necessary Conditions of Pardon, among which true Contrition and Repentance is fully declared; but *Confession to a Priest*, tho it may be useful for the ease of the Penitent, is no where in Scripture made necessary for the Forgiveness of Sin.

9. *In the use of Indulgences for taking away the Temporal Punishments of sin, remaining due after the Guilt is remitted.*

9. *I said, I will confess my Transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin,* Psal. 32. 5.

If God doth fully forgive the *Guilt* of sin, there remains no Obligation to punishment; for whereever that is, the *guilt* remains: It is true, God may not sometimes fully pardon; but he may reserve some temporal punishment here for his own Honour, or the Chastisement of a penitent Sinner: But then what have any men to do, to pretend that they can take off what God thinks fit to lay on? Can any *Indulgences* prevent pain or Sickness, or sudden Death? But if *Indulgences* be understood only with

Popery as Represented.

10. *In supposing that Penitent Sinners may in some measure satisfy by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c. for the Temporal Pain, which by order of God's Justice sometimes remains due, after the Guilt and the Eternal Pain are remitted.* P. 17.

11. *In thinking the Scripture not fit to be read generally by all, without Licence, or in the Vulgar Tongues.* P. 19.

Our Reasons against it.

respect to *Canonical Penances*, they are a most notorious and inexcusable Corruption of the Discipline of the Ancient Church.

10. *For if when we were Enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his Life*, Rom. 5. 10. And therefore no Satisfaction to the Justice of God is now required from us, for the Expiation of any remainder of Guilt. For if Christ's Satisfaction were in it self sufficient for a total Remission, and was so accepted by God; what Account then remains for the Sinner to discharge, if he perform the Conditions on his part? But we do not take away hereby the Duties of *Mortification, Prayer, Fasting*, and *Alms*, &c. but there is a difference to be made between the *Acts* of *Christian Duties*, and *Satisfaction to Divine Justice* for the Guilt of Sin, either in whole or in part. And to think to joyn any Satisfactions of ours, together with Christs, is like joyning our hand with Gods in Creating or Governing the World.

11. *Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly in all Wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another*, &c. *Coloss.* 3. 16.

How could that *dwell richly in them*, which was not to be communicated to them, but with great Caution? How could *they teach and admonish*

Popery as Repreſented.

Our Reaſons againſt it.

moniſh one another in a Language not underſtood by them? The Scriptures of the *New Teſtament* were very early perverted; and if this Reaſon were ſufficient to keep them out of the Hands of the People, certainly they would never have been publiſhed for common uſe, but as prudently diſpenſed then, as ſome think it neceſſary they ſhould be now. But we eſteem it a part of our Duty, not to think our ſelves wiſer than Chriſt or his Apoſtles, nor to deprive them of that unvaluable Treaſure which our Saviour hath left to their uſe.

12. *In allowing the Books of* Tobit, Judeth, Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdom, Maccabees, *to be Canonical.* P. 21.

12. *All Scripture is given by Inſpiration of God,* 2 Tim. 3. 16. *Holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt,* 2 Pet. 1. 21.

Therefore, where there is no Evidence of Divine Inſpiration, thoſe Books cannot be made Canonical: But the Jewiſh Church, *To whom the Oracles of God were committed,* never deliver'd theſe Books as any part of them, being Written when Inſpiration was ceaſed among them. And it is impoſſible for any Church in the World to make that to be divinely inſpired, which was not ſo from the Beginning.

13. *In preferring the Vulgar Latin Edition of the* Bible *before any other, and not allowing any Tranſlations into a Mother Tongue to be ordinarily read.* P. 24. 26.

13. *But I ſay, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their ſound went into all the Earth, and their Words unto the ends of the World.* Rom. 10. 18.

Therefore the Intention of God was, that the Goſpel ſhould be underſtood

Popery as Represented.

Our Reasons against it.

stood by all Mankind; which it could never be, unless it were translated into their several Languages. But still the difference is to be observed, between the Originals and Translations; and no Church can make a *Translation* equal to the *Original*. But among Translations, those deserve the greatest esteem which are done with the greatest Fidelity and Exactness. On which account our last Translation deserves a more particular Regard by us; as being far more useful to our People, than the *Vulgar Latin*, or any Translation made only from it.

14. *In believing that the Scripture alone can be no Rule of Faith to any Private or particular Person.* p. 28.

14. *Thy Word is a Lamp unto my Feet, and a Light unto my Path*, Psalm 119. 105.

Which it could never be, unless it were sufficient for necessary direction in our way to Heaven. But we suppose Persons to make use of the best means for understanding it, and to be duely qualified for following its Directions: without which, the best Rule in the World can never attain its End. And if the Scripture have all the due Properties of a Rule of Faith, it is unconceivable why it should be denied to be so; unless men find they cannot justify their Doctrines and Practices by it, and therefore are forced to make Tradition equal in Authority with it.

15. *In relying upon the Authority of the present Church for the Sense of Scripture.* p. 29.

15. *Wo unto you Lawyers, for ye have taken away the Key of Knowledge; ye*

Popery as Repreſented.

16. *In receiving and believing the Churches Traditions as the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and aſſenting to them with Divine Faith, juſt as he doth to the* Bible. p. 31, 32.

Our Reaſons againſt it.

ye entred not in your ſelves, and them that were entring in, ye hindred, S. Luk. 11. 52.

From whence it follows, that the preſent Guides of the Church may be ſo far from giving the true Senſe of Scripture, that they may be the chief Means to hinder Men from right underſtanding it. Which argument is of greater force, becauſe thoſe who plead for the Infallibility of the Guides of the preſent Church, do urge the promiſes made to the Jewiſh Church at that time; as our Author doth from thoſe *who ſate in the Chair of* Moſes, *and from* Caiaphas *his Propheſying.*

16. *We have alſo a more ſure word of Propheſie; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed,* 2 Pet. 1. 19.

And yet here the Apoſtle ſpeaks of ſomething delivered by the Teſtimony of thoſe who were with Chriſt in the Holy Mount; from whence we infer, that it was not the Deſign of Chriſt to leave us to any *Vocal Teſtimony*, but to refer us to the *Written word*, as the moſt certain Foundation of Faith. And it is not any Perſons aſſuming the Title of the Catholick Church to themſevles, can give them Authority to impoſe any Traditions on the Faith of Chriſtians; or require them to be believed, equally with the Written Word. For before any Traditions can be aſſented to with Divine Faith, the Churches

Autho-

Popery as Repreſented.

17. *In believing that the Preſent Guides of the Church being aſſembled in Councils for preſerving the Unity of the Church, have an Infallible Aſſiſtance in their Decrees.* P. 38.

18. *In believing the Pope to be the Supreme head of the Church under Chriſt, being Succeſſor to S.* Peter, *to whom he committed the care of his Flock.* P. 40, 41.

Our Reaſons againſt it.

Authority muſt be proved to be Divine and Infallible, either by a written or unwritten Word; but it can be done by neither, without overthrowing the neceſſity of ſuch an Infallibility in order to Divine Faith; becauſe the Teſtimony on whch the Churches Infallibility is proved, muſt be received only in a way of Credibility.

17. *Alſo of your own ſelves ſhall Men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things to draw away Diſciples after them.* Acts 20. 30.

Which being ſpoken of the *Guides* of the *Chriſtian Church*, without Limitation of Number, a poſſibility of Error is implied in any Aſſembly of them; unleſs there were ſome other Promiſes which did aſſure us, That in all great Aſſemblies the Spirit of God ſhall always go with the caſting Voice, or the greater Number.

18. *And he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, and ſome Paſtors and Teachers—for the edifying of the Body of Chriſt—till we all come in the Unity of the Faith,* &c. Epheſ. 4. 13, 14, 15.

Now here being an account given of the Officers Chriſt appointed in his Church, in order to the *Unity* and *Edification* of it, it had been unfaithfulneſs in the Apoſtle to have left out the Head of it, in caſe Chriſt had appointed any. Becauſe this were of more conſequence than all the reſt; being declared neceſſary to Salvation

19. *In believing that Communion in both Kinds is an indifferent thing; and was so held for the first four hundred years after Christ; and that the first Precept for Receiving under both Kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope* Leo 1, *and confirmed by Pope* Gelasius. P. 51.

Salvation to be in subjection to him. But neither this Apostle, nor S *Peter* himself give the least intimation of it. Which it is impossible to conceive should have been left out in the Apostolical writings upon so many occasions of mentioning it, if ever Christ had instituted a Headship in the Church, and given it to S. *Peter* and his Successors in the See of *Rome*.

19. *For as often ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come*, 1 Cor. 15.26.

The Apostle speaking to all Communicants, plainly shews, that the Institution of Christ was, That all should partake of both Kinds, and so to continue to do as long as this Sacrament was to shew forth the Death of Christ, *viz.* till his Second coming. And there is no colour for asserting the Christian Church ever looked on observing Christs Institution in this matter as an indifferent thing; no not for a thousand years after Christ. Altho the Practice and the Obligation are two things, yet when the Practise was so agreeable to the Institution, and continued so long in the Church; it is hardly possible for us to prove the sense of the Obligation by a better way than by the continuance of the Practise. And if some Traditions must be thought binding, and far from being indifferent, which want all that Evidence which this practise carries along with it, How unreasonable is it in this Case to allow the Practise, and to deny the Obligation? Q 20. *In*

Popery as Represented.	Our Reasons against it.
20. *In believing that the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded on Scripture, Authority, and Reason.* p. 54, &c.	20. *And whom he justified, them he also glorified,* Rom. 8. 30.
	But whom God justifies, they have the Remission of their Sins as to Eternal Punishment. And if those who are thus justified, must be glorified, what place is there for Purgatory? For there is not the least intimation of any other state of Punishment that any who are justified must pass through before they are admitted to Glory. We grant they may, notwithstanding, pass through many intermediate tryals in this World; but we say, where there is Justification, there is *no Condemnation*; but where any part of guilt remains unremitted, there is a Condemnation remaining so far as the punishment extends. And so this distinction as to Eternal and Temporal Pains, as it is made the Foundation of Purgatory, is wholly groundless; and therefore the Doctrine built upon it can have no Foundation in Scripture or Reason.
21. *In believing that to the saying of Prayers well and devoutly, it is not necessary to have attention on the Words, or on the Sense of Prayers.* p. 62.	21. *I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the Understanding also,* 1 Cor. 14. 15.
	What need *this Praying with the Understanding*, if there were no necessity of attending to the sense of prayers? For then *praying with the Spirit* were all that was required: For that supposes *an attention of the Mind upon God.* And I can hardly believe any Man that thinks with understanding, can justifie praying without it: Especially when there are Exhortations and

Popery as Represented.

22. *In believing that none out of the Communion of the Church of* Rome *can be saved; and that it is no Uncharitableness to think so.* P. 92.

23. *In believing that the Church of* Rome, *in all the new Articles defined at* Trent, *hath made no Innovation in matters of Faith.* P. 107.

Our Reasons against it.

and Invitations to the People to joyn in those Prayers, as it is plain there are in the *Roman* Offices.

22. *Then* Peter *opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of Persons; but in every Nation, he that feareth God, and worketh Righteousness, is accepted with him,* Acts 10. 34, 35.

Whereby we perceive, that God doth not limit the possibility of Salvation under the Gospel to Communion with the See of *Rome*; for if S. *Peter* may be believed, the capacity of Salvation depends upon Mens *fearing God and working Righteousness*; and it is horrible Uncharitableness to exclude those from a possibility of Salvation, whom God doth not exclude from it.

23. *That ye should earnestly contend for the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints,* Jude *v.* 3.

Therefore all necessary Doctrines of Faith were at first delivered; and whatever Articles cannot be proved to have been delivered by the Apostles, can never be made necessary to be believed in order to Salvation. Which overthrows the additional Creed of *Pius* IV. after the Council of *Trent*; and puts them upon the necessity of proving the Universal Tradition of those Doctrines from the Apostolical Times: And when they do that, we may think better of them than at present we do; for as yet we can see neither *Scripture*, nor *Reason*, nor *Antiquity* for them.

THUS I have *Represented* that kind of *Popery* which our Author, (who complains so much of *Misrepresenting*) allows; and I have in short, set down how little ground we have to be fond of it; nay, to speak more plainly, it is that we can never yield to, without betraying the Truth, renouncing our Senses and Reason, wounding our Consciences, dishonouring God and his Holy Word and Sacraments, perverting the Doctrine of the Gospel as to Christs Satisfaction, Intercession and Remission of Sins; depriving the People of the Means of Salvation which God himself hath appointed, and the Primitive Church observed, and damning those for whom Christ died.

We do now in the sincerity of our Hearts appeal to God and the World, That we have no design to *Misrepresent* them, or to make their Doctrines and Practises appear worse than they are: But take them with all the Advantages even this Author hath set them out with, we dare appeal to the Judgments and Consciences of any impartial men, whether (the Scripture being allowed on both sides) our Doctrines be not far more agreeable thereto than the *new Articles of Trent*, which are the very Life and Soul of Popery? Whether our Worship of God be not more suitable to the Divine Nature and Perfections, and the Manifestations of his Will, than the *worship of Images*, and *Invocation of Fellow Creatures*? Whether the plain Doctrine of the necessity of Repentance and sincere Obedience to the commands of Christ, do not tend more to promote Holiness in the World, than *the Sacrament of Penance*, as it is delivered and allowed to be practised in the Church of *Rome*, *i. e.* with the *easiness* and *efficacy* of *Absolution*, and getting off the remainders by *Indulgences*, *Satisfactions* of others, and *Prayers for the dead*? Whether it be not more according to the Institution of Christ to have *the Communion in both Kinds*, and to have *Prayers and the Scriptures in a Language which the People understand*? And lastly, whether there be not more of *Christian charity* in believing and hoping the best of those vast Bodies of Christians, who live out of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, in the *Eastern*, *Southern*, *Western*, and *Northern* Parts, than to pronounce them all uncapable of Salvation on that Account? And therefore out of regard to God and the Holy Religion of our Blessed Saviour; out of regard to the Salvation of our own and other Souls, we cannot but very much prefer the Communion of our own Church, before that of the *Church* of *Rome*.

But before I conclude all, I must take some notice of his *Anathema's*: And here I am as much unsatisfied, as in any other part of his Book, and that for these Reasons.

1. Because he hath no manner of Authority to make them, suppose they were

were meant never so sincerely: And if we should ever object them to any others of that Church, they would presently say, *What had he to do to make Anathema's? It belongs only to the Church and the General Councils to pronounce Anathema's, and not to any private Person whatsoever.* So that if he would have published *Anathema's* with Authority, he ought to have printed those of the Council of *Trent*; *viz.* such as these,

Cursed is he that doth not allow the Worship of Images.
Cursed is he that saith Saints are not to be Invocated.
Cursed is he that doth not believe Transubstantiation, Purgatory, &c.

2. Because he leaves out an *Anathema* in a very material point, *viz. As to the Deposing Doctrine.* We do freely, and from our Hearts *Anathematize* all such Doctrines as tend to dissolve the Bonds of Allegiance to our Soveraign, on any pretence whatsoever. Why was this past over by him, without any kind of *Anathema*? Since he seems to approve the *Oxford Censures*, P. 48. Why did he not here show his zeal against all such dangerous Doctrines? *If the Deposing Doctrine* be falsly charged upon their Church, let us but once see it *Anathematized* by publick Authority of their Church, and we have done: But instead thereof, we find in a Book very lately published with great Approbations, by a present *Professor* at *Lovain Fr. D' Enghien*, all the Censures on the other side censured and despised: and the holding the Negative as to the *Deposing Doctrine*, is declared by him to be *Heresie, or next to Heresie*: The Censure of the *Sorbon* against *Sanctarellus*, he saith, *was onely done by a Faction*; *and that of Sixty Eight Doctors, there were but Eighteen present*; *and the late Censure of the* Sorbon, he saith, *was condemned by the Inquisition at* Toledo, Jan. 10. 1683. *as erroneous and Schismatical.*; and so by the *Clergy* of *Hungary*, Oct. 24. 1682.

Auctoritas Sedis Apostolicæ in Reges. P. 374. 408. ad 430. P. 549.

We do not question but there are Divines that oppose it; but we fear there are too many who do not; and we find they boast of their own numbers, and despise the rest as an inconsiderable Party: This we do not *Misrepresent* them in, for their most approved Books do shew it.

However, we do not question, but there are several worthy and Loyal Gentlemen of that Religion, of *different Principles and Practises*: And it is pity such be not distinguished from those who will not renounce a Doctrine so dangerous in the Consequences of it.

3. Because the *Anathema's* he hath set down, are not Penned so plainly and clearly, as to give any real Satisfaction: but with so much Art and Sophistry, as if they were intended to beguile weak and unwary Readers, who see not into the depth of these things, and therefore may think he hath done great matters

matters in his *Anathema's*, when if they be ſtrictly examined, they come to little or nothing; as

1. *Curſed is he that commits Idolatry.* An unwary Reader would think herein he diſowned all *real Idolatry*; but he doth not curſe any thing as *Idolatry*, but what *himſelf* thinks to be ſo. So again *Curſed is he* (not that gives Divine Worſhip to Images, but) *that prays to Images, or Relicks as Gods, or Worſhips them for Gods.* So that if he doth not take the Images themſelves for Gods, he is ſafe enough from his own *Anathema.*

2. *Curſed is every Goddeſs Worſhipper, i. e.* That believes the Bleſſed Virgin not to be a Creature. And ſo they eſcape all the force of this *Anathema. Curſed is he that Honours her, or puts his truſt in her more than in God.* So that if they Honour her and truſt in her but juſt as much as in God, they are ſafe enough; Or *that believes her to be above her Son*: But no *Anathema* to ſuch as ſuppoſe her to be equal to him.

3. *Curſed is he that believes the Saints in Heaven to be his Redeemer, that prays to them as ſuch.* What if men pray to them as their *Spiritual Guardians and Protectors*? Is not this giving Gods Honour to them? Doth this deſerve no *Anathema*?

4. *Curſed is he that worſhips any breaden God, or makes Gods of the empty Elements of Bread and Wine: viz.* That ſuppoſes them to be *nothing but Bread and Wine*, and yet ſuppoſes them to be *Gods* too. Doth not this look like Nonſenſe? And yet I am afraid our Author would think it a ſevere *Anathema* in this matter, to ſay, *Curſed is he who believes Nonſenſe and Contradictions.*

It will be needleſs to ſet down more, ſince I have endeavoured by clear ſtating the ſeveral Controverſies, to prevent the Readers being impoſed upoa by deceitful *Anathema's.* And yet after all he ſaith,

Curſed are we, if in anſwering and ſaying Amen *to any of theſe Curſes, we uſe any Equivocations or Mental Reſervations, or do not aſſent to them in the common and obvious uſe of the Words.*

But there may be no Equivocation in the very Words, and yet there may be a great one in the intention and deſign of them: There may be none in ſaying *Amen* to the Curſes ſo worded; but if he would have prevented all ſuſpicion of Equivocation, he ought to have put it thus,

Curſed are we, if we have not fairly and ingenucuſly expreſſed the whole Meaning of our Church as to the Points condemned in theſe Anathema's; or if we have by them deſigned to deceive the People: And then I doubt he would not ſo readily have ſaid *Amen.*

THE

THE

CONTENTS.

AN *Answer to his Introduction.* Page 1.
1. *Of Praying to Images.* p. 10.
2. *Of Worshipping Saints.* p. 17.
3. *Of Addressing more Supplications to the Virgin* Mary *than to Christ.* p. 24.
4. *Of Paying Divine Worship to Relicks.* p. 30.
5. *Of the Eucharist.* p. 32.
1. *Of Adoration of the Host.* p. 33.
2. *Of Transubstantiation.* p. 35.
6. *Of Merits and good Works.* p. 42.
7. *Of Confession.* p. 46.
8. *Of Indulgences.* p. 48.
9. *Of Satisfaction.* p. 51.
10. *Of Reading the Holy Scriptures.* p. 52.
11. *Of Apocryphal Books* p. 55.
12. *Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.* p. 57.
13. *Of the Scripture as a Rule of Faith.* p. 58.
14. *Of the Interpretation of Scripture.* p. 59.
15. *Of Tradition.* p. 61.
16. *Of Councils.* p. 62.
17. *Of Infallibility in the Church.* p. 63.
18. *Of the Pope.* p. 65.
19. *Of Dispensations.* p. 68.
20. *Of the Deposing Power.* p. 71.
21. *Of Communion in one Kind.* p. 76.
22. *Of the Mass.* p. 79.
23. *Of Purgatory.* p. 80.
24. *Of Praying in an Unknown Tongue.* p. 86.
25. *Of*

25. *Of the Second Commandment.* p. 88.
26. *Of Mental Reſervations.* p. 89.
27. *Of a Deathbed Repentance.* p. 91.
28. *Of Faſting.* p. 92.
29. *Of Schiſms and Diviſions in the Church.* p. 94.
30. *Of Friars and Nuns.* p. 96.
31. *Of Wicked Principles and Practices.* p. 97.
32. *Of Miracles.* p. 98.
33. *Of Holy Water.* p. 100.
34. *Of Breeding up People in Ignorance.* p. 102.
35. *Of the Uncharitableneſs of the Papiſts* p. 103.
36. *Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.* p. 104.
37. *Of Innovations in matters of Faith.* p. 105.
An Anſwer to his Concluſion. p. 107.

FINIS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

A Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation, Printed for *W. Rogers.*

63128